

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXV

AUGUST, 1932

No. 146

EDITORIAL

THE article which we publish this month from the pen of the Bishop of Colombo is an illustration of the difficulties which attend the translation of even the most liberal schemes of Reunion into practice. Most of us supposed that the skilful and original plan endorsed by the Lambeth Conference in 1930 would satisfy the Nonconformist bodies in India that they were not to be "absorbed," and that the principle of intercommunion as the result, and not the supposed precursor, of Reunion was accepted and agreed. The claim is now advanced, however, that this principle shall be subject to exceptions, and that "special occasions" shall be recognized when intercommunion shall take place; and indeed it is even intimated that this recognition is almost a condition precedent of the later Reunion. We sympathize whole-heartedly with the Bishop of Colombo's position. To make exceptions on the basis of an assured and established principle is often the path of wisdom and charity, and the whole history of economy in the East, of dispensation in the West, and of latitude in the English Church, is concerned with these. But to make exceptions from a principle which is not established but precarious, and of which the effective trial still lies ahead, is a very different matter. It inevitably creates a very serious doubt as to whether or not the principle is really accepted by those who profess that it will govern their actions in the future.

The success of the Lausanne Conference, even if Germany should decline to ratify it, may well represent a turning-point in the recent history of Europe; and the Prime Minister would seem to have won for this country the same kind of position in the counsels of the nations as it occupied in the days of Lord Salisbury. There is still a great work of healing to be done before conditions conducive to a normal economic life can be said to exist; but at least a beginning has been made and a movement of collaboration set going.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CONVERSION*

I. THE DEFINITION OF CONVERSION

WHAT are we to understand by the term conversion? Does it signify merely, as Pratt says, the achievement of a new self, the unification of character, the inner unity of perfect moral self-hood? So wide a definition enables Pratt to include conversion *from* religion as well as conversion *to* religion, but in effect it covers the whole course of experience from infancy to death and provides no guidance as to how a converted person may be recognized. Starbuck regards conversion as "the more or less sudden change of character from evil to goodness, from sinfulness to righteousness, and from indifference to spiritual insight and activity." Coe is even more emphatic on conversion as a datable event in an individual life: "When religious self-realization," he says, "is intense and is attained with some abruptness, then we have conversion." Coe's implicit recognition of conversion as a mutation of values is developed by Saunders in his *Adventures of the Christian Soul*, where he defines conversion as "the process by which the God-consciousness hitherto marginal and vague becomes focal and clearly defined, passing from its former position as an accessory to its new position as the most real and penetrative influence in life." It is impossible, however, to regard the God-consciousness in such classic cases of conversion as those of St. Paul, St. Augustine, or John Wesley as only marginal though subsequently focal. The trouble with many converts is not that their God-consciousness is marginal, but that it is so focal as to give them no peace until it is either subordinated and co-ordinated with other constituents of experience or is allowed to diffuse its radiance and control throughout both focal and marginal consciousness. The element of surrender cannot be overlooked in any definition of conversion, and this surrender must be definite and conscious, something more than relatively passive acquiescence. In like manner James' general definition seems to fail to bring out the central act of surrender. He describes conversion as "the process, gradual or sudden, by

* BIBLIOGRAPHY: Thouless, *Psychology of Religion*; Allier, *La Psychologie de la Conversion* (Paris: Paigot, 1925); Grensted, *Psychology and God* (Longmans, 1930); Mendousse, *L'Ame de l'Adolescent* (Paris: Alcan, 1930); de Sanctis, *Religious Conversion* (Kegan Paul, 1927); Underwood, *Conversion: Christian and Non-Christian* (London: Allen, 1925); James, *V.R.E.* (Longmans, 1902); Hastings, *E.R.E.* (1911); Bazin, *Charles de Foucauld* (B. and O., 1923); Rahilly, *Father William Doyle* (Longmans, 1925); Hocking, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, 1927; Selwyn, *The Approach to Christianity* (Longmans, 1925).

which a self hitherto divided and consciously wrong, inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior and happy in consequence of its firmer hold upon religious realities." This account of the matter will cover both the awakening and the enlightenment or illumination—the glory of the lighted mind—which seem to characterize most conversions, and it will include those which are pre-eminently emotional together with those pre-eminently intellectual. But not only does James' definition seem to me to be inadequate in respect of the central act of surrender; it fails also, I would suggest, to bring out the mutation and transformation of values which conversion implies. De Sanctis is surely right in distinguishing between conversion as return home, or renewal of a long-held but dormant faith, and conversion proper which implies, he says, "mutation not of cult, but rather of conscience regarding the sentiment and practice of a religion." The Parable of the Prodigal Son would seem to illustrate this distinction. His return home to his father was not in itself the *crux conversionis*; rather, the fundamental fact was that *he came to himself*. When he came to himself, then he was converted. The sequelæ are part of the spiritual convalescence but are not themselves the cure. The cure, the conversion, lies in the righted mind, which, being righted, adjusts its scheme of conduct-values and surrenders thereto. De Sanctis points out how difficult it is to distinguish true and genuine conversion, involving complete mutation of values from recognition of, and return to earlier but neglected or temporarily abandoned faith and habits. To discard devotional exercises does not necessarily imply complete rejection of the beliefs upon which they are grounded; the beliefs may survive and recur, enabling the discarded habits to be resumed. The true metanoia is something more than return home; it is a fundamental transformation involving surrender, revaluation, and the emergence of something new. The recognition of this novel element in conversion has its bearing upon the question of predictability, to which reference must be made later in this essay.

De Sanctis therefore declines to regard philosophical and moral conversions such as those effected by Seneca as comparable with religious conversion proper. They are "little more than aspirations towards the attainment of immediate peace, or towards the achievement of a death without fear," whereas religious conversion is necessarily concerned with values which are more universal, transcendent and immortal. In view of the facts of Wordsworth's conversion as recorded in the *Prelude*, which will call for discussion presently, this distinction seems to me hardly tenable.

Underwood, whose book on *Conversion, Christian and Non-Christian* appeared some time earlier than that by de Sanctis, seems to me to come to a more satisfactory definition of conversion, with special reference to its comparative aspects, when he describes it as "a reaction taking the form of a psychological surrender to an ideal, and issuing in moral development." He claims that such a definition covers religious conversions whether Christian or non-Christian, together with ethical and intellectual conversions in the Græco-Roman world and amongst the early Buddhists. The conversion of Buddha in particular, as we shall see, is a conversion by illumination or enlightenment coming long after a great renunciation.

But while Underwood's statement seems to me to express aright the fundamental fact of surrender, it errs by both excess and defect. It is too limited in its stress on moral development in the convert: surely conversion means spiritual awakening, spiritual regeneration, spiritual enlightenment as well as ethical adjustment? And it is stretching the term too wide to make it cover all modes and grades of psychological adjustment.

I would suggest that a felt unrest, an apprehended discord, some "knocking at the gate" is essential in conversion proper, but I would not call this in every case a sense of sin. Further, under the strain, prolonged or intensified to the point of being unendurable, a new perception of values is engendered, surrender to which provides the resolution of the discord, the way of escape; in religious conversion proper these values are apprehended as embodied either in a God perceived to be personal, or in a principle the potency of which is itself personal. The surrender to these values entails such an adjustment of the way of life, physical and psychological, public and private, social and individual, as to mean in general the acceptance of vocation. From that surrender and from that acceptance of vocation a growing peace and power ensue. Growth in holiness will characterize the true convert: he is a saint in the making.

Even so, however, no appropriate definition of conversion could safely exclude all reference to that sense of objectivity, that apprehension of Givenness, of the part played by some power or source other than himself which converts themselves seem to be wellnigh unanimous in affirming. Psychology may perhaps rightly decline to undertake the metaphysical or theological interpretation of grace, but it cannot fairly ignore it, yet of the authorities from whom I have quoted only Saunders explicitly uses the term "God-consciousness." To indicate this feature of conversion therefore I propose provisionally to incorporate the term *vouchsafed* in the definition I would now suggest. By conversion therefore I mean that definitive re-

orientation of life and mutation of values which is vouchsafed under some stress or need for inner harmony and which issues in a discipline of conduct conformable to those values, controlled by a conscious surrender to vocation, with stability, serenity and power in varying degree. Conviction of sin is no essential prelude to conversion, but certainty, surrender and attainment are essential in the epilogue. I lay stress on this point because James asserts with great emphasis* that "converted men as a class are indistinguishable from natural men . . . there is no unmistakable class mark distinctive of all true converts." I am inclined to think that joy, sense of release, peace, power, invariably distinguish the convert not so much from other folk as from his former self. As Browning says of Kharshish:

"Whence has man the balm that brightens all?
He holds on firmly to some thread of life
(It is the life to lead, perforcedly)."

Conversion is in fact an æsthetic process. The convert has but one song, "*Magnificat anima mea*," and but one secret, "For my Beloved's mine and I am His."

II. TYPES OF CONVERSION

A somewhat unnecessary amount of attention has been devoted to the classification of types of conversion. In the main, two types have been distinguished, the sudden and the gradual. De Sanctis calls the first fulminant, the second progressive. They may also be called the catastrophie and the continuous respectively. But such a classification refers chiefly to the supposed duration, swift or slow, of the conversion, and upon closer examination the apparently sudden conversion is generally ushered in by many unmistakable signs, while the slow or progressive conversion similarly has its peak points, its memorabilia, to date it. Hence Starbuck attempts an alternative classification, accepted by James, into a volitional type and an impulsive or self-surrender type. This is at bottom the earlier classification, and Pratt provides a truer alternative in dividing conversion into the volitional and the affective respectively. More recently a wide survey of conversions in the non-Christian religions of India, and especially in Buddhism, has led Underwood to distinguish between intellectual, moral, and emotional conversions—i.e., three types as compared with the traditional two. He regards the conversion of the Buddha and of St. Paul as both alike in being intellectual: a classification, conversion, and illumination of thought. But is it really possible so to isolate

* *Op. cit.*, 238.

one factor in the conversion of St. Paul? May not his case be also regarded as a moral conversion? The pricks against which he rebelled were surely not merely dialectical problems? And is there not this great difference between Buddha and Paul, that the one is converted to a noble way of Enlightenment essentially impersonal in character, while Paul is converted towards a person to whom thenceforth he is in such fealty bound that to him to live is Christ and to die is gain? Conversion to a *system* of thought is one thing, conversion to a Life identified with an Other Person is surely different? If we must classify, can we really put Paul and Buddha in the same group? Will there not be in every individual convert of great stature of soul not only intellectual and moral but also emotional factors of co-ordinate importance? Nor am I happier with Underwood's second type, moral conversions, in which, he says, the subject after living a depraved and sinful life is emancipated not only from sinful habits but also from the very love of sin. Not every convert has lived a depraved and sinful life, not every youth when converted casts off the shackles of sinful habits. Such language is too strong. It is to limit conversion to those who are guilty and habitually guilty of grave and mortal sins; but do we not all know cases of genuine conversion of the once born, of those glad hearts without reproach or blot who nevertheless quietly arrive at a richer, more personal sense of surrender and vocation, who are really born again, not in the throes of spiritual labour, but quietly, easily and well? Some stress I would admit as an essential prelude to conversion, but not such stress as is signified by the intensive phrase a sense or conviction of sin. In like manner the third type, the emotional, in Underwood's scheme cannot be sharply delineated from his other two. The emotional type is said to be that in which "conversion is the birth of a new and dominating affection . . . not a classification of thought, not an accession of moral ability, but the reorganization of the emotional life round a new centre." The subject falls in love. But this really happens in every case, varying only in intensity: some loves are tempestuous, others are serene, so it is in conversion. De Sanctis devotes much attention to the fulminant type of conversion and especially refers to Lutoslawski's account of his own conversion as given to the Geneva Congress in 1909. The Polish philosopher had experienced a violent mental crisis at the age of sixteen as a result of which he had abandoned the faith of his fathers. For some years he remained an alien to religion until, he says, there came to him while taking a vapour bath the idea of cleansing his soul as well as his body. He forthwith proceeded to church, made his confession, and despite his continued disbelief in the Real Presence, he communicated.

Then there occurred, he says, in the very act of reception, the sudden awareness of an imperative command from an indisputable power, to reunite his life with the Church of his upbringing. It was, he says, "like a flash of lightning comparable to the conversion of St. Paul." De Sanctis regards such a conversion as largely due in fact to a sudden uprush from the subconscious. The subconscious is to be regarded as not unlike geological strata; the contents of the subconscious are not to be thought of as a random and heterogeneous collection, but as phenomena deposited at different levels corresponding with the period of their formation. Sudden upheavals from any of these levels may occur, and it is these upheavals from long continued but quiescent sources of psychic power which give the instantaneous or fulminant character to conversions. But such upheavals are themselves assisted by the midwifery, as it were, of the conscious will, and the conversional process is developed with the aid of volitional acts. Hence the stress laid by many Catholic directors upon Acts of Will, Acts of Faith, Acts of Love, and so on, as facilitating a real conversion and acceptance of vocation.

Hence, while the possibility of instantaneous or fulminant conversions cannot be denied, and while a climacteric in the conversion process must be recognized, such a type is not, according to de Sanctis, the usual type, and upon analysis all conversions are seen to be much more progressive and anticipated than is commonly supposed. Every conversion therefore has something unique about it, something which will tempt the convert to ascribe to some one moment an instantaneous and decisive significance, yet the difference between the types becomes so attenuated as almost to vanish altogether. Some souls even seem to specialize in repeated conversions: they are neither once born, nor twice born, nor continuously born, but oft-born; they cultivate what Hawker called "spasms of the ganglia."

A. A. COCK.

(To be concluded)

A PROBLEM IN SOUTH INDIA

WHEN the Bishops of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon met in the Episcopal Synod at Calcutta last February they had to consider an important question which had been sent up from the Joint Committee engaged in carrying on the negotiations for union in South India. This was a question concerning inter-communion, embodied in a resolution passed by the Wesleyan Synod in South India, which runs as follows:

"In our judgment it will help greatly to increase the spirit of unity between the consulting Churches, and within our own Church to win the mind of our people, if, even before union is consummated, united worship and especially intercommunion between the consulting Churches can be made possible. The absence of intercommunion at this time constitutes a most formidable obstacle to union in the minds of many of our people."

On the Joint Committee these opinions were expressed both by the Wesleyan delegates and by those of the South India United Church; and our own delegates resolved to refer the matter to the Metropolitan, who brought it before the Episcopal Synod.

The question was debated for many hours by the Bishops, both when assessors were present and when they were sitting alone, and for the first time in the experience of the writer in a discussion of a matter of major importance they failed to reach agreement. Eventually it was realized that the only way by which a ruling could be issued was by a majority vote in the Synod, and the following resolution was the result:

"The Synod has received the request of the S.I.U. and Wesleyan Churches that in the meetings of the Joint Committee and in conferences organized directly by it the members should be at liberty to unite in Communion Services presided over by ministers of one or other of the uniting Churches. It is urged that the omission of this final act of fellowship is a serious stumbling-block to the negotiations and that, if such united communions were made possible, the success of the negotiations would be materially advanced.

"It must be at once explained that this request raises the most difficult problem which has yet come before our Church in these negotiations: if compliance would help the uniting Churches, it would alienate the sympathy of many in the Anglican Communion who definitely consider the interchanging of ministries of separated Churches to be wrong in any circumstances whatever. Indeed it has been found impossible for the Episcopal Synod and its assessors to come to a common mind on the subject.

"The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has at its session of February, 1932, given 'general approval' to the Scheme of Union; and we can therefore assure the Churches that our hesitation in acceding to their request implies no wavering about the Scheme. 'General approval' is the first formal step in the stage of its adoption by our Church: and that step was taken with only two dissentient votes. In the Scheme thus generally approved it is provided that all the ministers of the uniting Churches shall be ministers of the united Church, and this hesitation must not be taken to imply any drawing back from any of the statements agreed upon by the Scheme, which the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has by its resolution generally approved. Nor does the hesitation imply that the Synod does not fully acknowledge the manifest spiritual gifts which attend the ministries of other Churches.

"The doubt concerns the wisdom of this method of trying to further union and the question of putting a stumbling-block in the way of those whose consciences are unable to approve the interchanging of ministries of separated Churches. Organically the union of Churches can only be effected by the unification of their ministries: and union cannot be achieved so long as separately organized Churches are determined to continue separate ministries. It is for that reason that many Anglicans are unable to use the ministries of other Churches, while not denying that God is working in and through them in their Churches. They believe that by doing so they would be helping to perpetuate separation. As it is a foundation principle of the union that liberty of conscience must be given to all, the Synod feels that it cannot issue any instruction in this matter to its delegates.

"There are, however, two factors in the present situation which have weighed strongly with the Synod.

"There do come occasions in great spiritual movements when the presence of God's Spirit is realized in a very special measure, and the Synod rejoices that that has been the experience of the Joint Committee. It desires greatly that nothing which it may do shall in any way blur that experience or hinder His working. And it is in that setting that it has anxiously explored every possibility.

"There is a further point which the Synod has most anxiously considered. It is eager to hasten the time when intercommunion may be achieved. The majority of the Synod considers that when all the Churches are pledged to complete the union, and substantial agreement on fundamental matters has been reached by the three negotiating Churches, and they are thus pledged to put an end to the continuance of separated ministries, the results of a formally achieved union may on special occasions be enjoyed by anticipation. And further, though the Synod is unable formally to endorse the procedure asked for, because the matter is one on which the Church of this Province has not yet reached a common mind, a majority of the Synod is unwilling to limit the liberty of the delegates in this matter or to call in question the action of any who feel impelled, in view of the agreement already reached and in confident expectation that full agreement will be attained, to join in the Lord's Supper celebrated by ministers of the other uniting Churches at meetings of the Joint Committee and Retreats organized directly by it. In giving this liberty the Synod would emphasize the fact that it cannot believe that general intercommunion before union is the right way of working for unity: and further it asks the other Churches not to misunderstand the attitude of those who even on these special occasions do not feel that they can depart from their lifelong rule.

"Because we feel that such intercommunion may still be only partial and that all may not feel free in this way to consummate that spiritual nearness to God which is so marked a feature of its gatherings, the Synod considered another method of achieving that end: namely, that if representative ministers of all the three Churches joined in celebrating the communion on the occasions referred to in the last paragraph (together leading in the essential parts of the service) the desired object would be attained. This proposal was suggested by an old custom of the Church that on special occasions presbyters celebrated the communion with the Bishop. This joining in the celebration would be a not inappropriate symbol of our oneness in the desire for union and in our approach to God: and it seems

to many members of the Synod that this would be the truest and most fitting method of giving expression to that fellowship into which we are being led by the gracious wisdom of our Heavenly Father."

For the elucidation of this resolution two notes may be added. It will be noticed that, while the Wesleyan resolution seems to contemplate some plan of general intercommunion, the only measure of intercommunion suggested by the majority vote of the Episcopal Synod is on the occasion of meetings of the Joint Committee and of Retreats (more strictly, Conferences) organized by it in South India. Secondly, it should be borne in mind what are the proposals of the Scheme for Union with regard to the ministry after the Union has been inaugurated. The basis of union is the acceptance of the historic episcopate; all ordinations after union shall be episcopal; but all the ordained ministers (whether ordained episcopally or otherwise) of the uniting Churches in the area of the union shall be acknowledged as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the united Church provided that they assent to the basis of union and accept the Constitution of the united Church. There is, however, an important "conscience clause," known as the Pledge, which provides that, while liberty is granted to individuals to communicate in any of the churches within the Union, no arrangements with regard to churches, congregations or ministers will knowingly be made, either generally or in particular cases, which would offend the conscientious convictions of any persons directly concerned or which would transgress the long-established traditions of any of the uniting Churches. This pledge is understood to make provision for the appointment of a presbyter episcopally ordained to minister in any church or congregation where such a ministry has been the rule (*i.e.*, in churches which before the union belonged to the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon): but at the same time individuals who formerly were Anglicans will not be forbidden after the union to make use of the other forms of ministry (*i.e.*, they will be free to go to a Communion celebrated by a minister of the united Church who has not been episcopally ordained).

With these points before us let us first of all consider the main arguments that are put forward in support of the resolution. Those in favour of the decision arrived at by the majority in the Episcopal Synod urge that they are not for one moment contemplating any such policy as that of general intercommunion. Indeed, they consider that such a policy would be a grave mistake. They are legislating only in the restricted field of the meetings of the Joint Committee and of Conferences organized by it. To them the all-important point is that the negotiating Churches have all agreed upon the historic episcopate as the basis of union

and have thus already declared their will to union. They bear in mind the passage in the Report of the Committee on the Unity of the Church in the Lambeth Conference, 1930, Report (p. 116) which states: "The will and intention to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the Body of Christ of necessity underlie all its organizations; and where unity has been broken, the earnest desire to restore union makes possible a recognition by the Church, in some respects, of ministries which, in separation, must stand on a different footing." Yet, even so, they have no idea or intention of giving formal *recognition* of non-Episcopal ministries by their vote in the Episcopal Synod; or indeed of even raising that question at all. It is held that, in the drawing together of the different elements in South India into a union, God is creating a new thing, and that in these circumstances one cannot be bound by the logic and traditions of the past; those called to be leaders must be free to make ventures and allow actions which may not fit in to any received scheme or order. In any case, all that the promoters of the resolution conceive they are doing is to anticipate the state of affairs, which will be inaugurated at the union, and to grant liberty to our delegates to communicate at a Communion Service conducted by a minister of the negotiating Churches, if the delegates feel conscientiously drawn to do so. They think that the point reached in the negotiations fully justifies such anticipation. Agreement has been reached, they say, on all the major issues, and the parties concerned are one in heart and mind in their desire for union. They speak of the moving spiritual experiences of their meetings, and they consider that this freedom of intercommunion amongst the delegates is required both to crown such experiences and break down any barriers which still stand in the way of complete mutual understanding and fellowship. Even so, they do not declare that they and their companions are going to avail themselves of such liberty; they only urge that they must be free to do so if a movement of the Spirit leads them to such an act. There can be no question that the decision of the majority of the Bishops of this Province raises an issue of quite first-rate importance, not only in the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, but in the whole Anglican Communion. It cannot be confined within a restricted area, for it touches and affects principles which the Churches of the Anglican Communion hold in common. I submit, therefore, that here is an issue of such importance that each one of us ought to examine it carefully and seek to arrive at some definite conclusion about it. This duty has lain as a heavy burden upon me ever since the question was raised, for I found myself obliged on grounds of conscience and principle to come to a conclusion different from that arrived at by most of my brother

Bishops. I found there was no other course open to me than to record my vote with the minority in the Synod, for I believe that the Bishops who voted in favour of the resolution have made a grave error of judgment. Now this is a very unhappy position to be in, and I am acutely conscious of the fact. In the first place, there is no one in the Province who dislikes controversy more than I do; and further, I hold my brother Bishops in such affectionate regard that it is extremely painful to be obliged to be at variance with them. But one must be honest; and what one conceives to be loyalty to principle may demand a decided line of action when feelings of friendship urge one at least to be neutral. Moreover, now that the facts of the problem are generally known, I think it is important that some expression should be given to the views of the minority in the Synod. Considerations of time and distance prevent me from submitting this article to my brother Bishops of the minority, if it is to see the light without undue delay. I must, therefore, take the sole responsibility for its contents, though I have reason to believe that in the main it may be said to represent the views not only of the Bishops who voted with me but of a considerable body of opinion within the Province.

I hope, with this word of explanation, I may be excused the frequent repetition of the personal pronoun.

I pass now to state my reasons for voting against the ruling given by the majority in the Episcopal Synod. I felt bound to disagree with the ruling on the grounds of principle, of policy, and of what is expedient in the cause of union.

1. In my opinion it is wrong in principle to depart from the Anglican rule that the celebrant of the Holy Communion is to be a priest. Here at once arises a question which must be treated with respect and careful consideration. Is it right to stand thus rigidly by a rule? Is not one in danger in so doing of falling into the snare of formalism? Is not one running the risk of hindering and resisting the free action of the Holy Spirit?

I have thought over these and similar questions again and again, and I have tried to free myself from the spirit and attitude of mere rigidity and of adherence to ancient rules out of mere conservatism. Yet again and again I am brought back to the memory of the Lord's commission to the Apostles to be His stewards and ambassadors, and of the manner in which Christians have understood that commission down the ages. I remember that for fifteen hundred years the episcopal ministry had no rival and was not called in question; that when Christians separated from it in the sixteenth century the principle of union was lost and they became separated into hundreds of sects; and that by the providence of God we have inherited with the Faith the

ancient Order of the Church of the centuries. It is no light thing, therefore, that we should have committed ourselves in this Province to the statement in Declaration Five of our Provincial Constitution that "to no person except a Bishop or a priest is it committed or allowed to celebrate the Holy Eucharist." We have accepted this statement not merely because it is a rule of the Church of England or of any local Church, but because it has been accepted and recognized by the Catholic Church for hundreds of years. It is on principle, then, that the Bishops, the guardians of the Faith and Order of the Church, ought to maintain this rule; and the principle only gathers force as we recall the chaos that has come to the Church through its surrender. But it will be pointed out that the Bishops are very far from allowing general intercommunion. They are but anticipating the union and allowing now a liberty which is to be conceded after the union has been consummated. Let us by all means be scrupulously fair. I acknowledge fully that the Bishops have limited the concession of intercommunion to the meetings of the Joint Committee and of Conferences organized directly by it. But even so they have surrendered the principle of Catholic Order. What in effect they have really said is that on certain special occasions, even though four Bishops and several priests of our Province may be present, it does not really matter who is the celebrant of the Holy Communion; those under the Bishops' own jurisdiction on the Joint Committee may choose for themselves which ministry, episcopal or non-episcopal, they will use; indeed, the Bishops on the Joint Committee themselves may be found claiming this same liberty of communicating at a service conducted by a minister not episcopally ordained. Is not this strange teaching from the guardians of the Faith and Order of the Church?

But we must not forget that the concession of the Bishops is further qualified. They declare they are but seeking to anticipate the union. They can allow our members to go to non-episcopal Communion, because the celebrants will be ministers who have already accepted the principle of episcopacy as the basis of the union. But here again I am obliged to call their action in question. Yet in so doing, God forbid that I should seem even to suggest any limitation of His almighty power. Nothing could be further from my intention. I recognize humbly and fully that God can grant His great gifts through any means of His choosing wholly apart from or above any rules or traditions which we may hold or regard as the normal channels. Not for one moment, therefore, am I discussing the use God in His mercy and love may make of some other kind of ministry. I am, however, obliged to look at this question from the point of

view of those who have not only inherited the episcopal ministry, but are responsible for maintaining it. And I am bound to point out that we have received, and are responsible for maintaining, the *priesthood* of the Church of God; that it is to the priesthood that the celebration of the Liturgy has been committed; and that, however well disposed ministers may be towards episcopacy, they do not become priests by accepting episcopacy as the basis of union, but only by episcopal ordination. It would be a strange doctrine indeed if it were to be maintained that, as soon as a minister declares his acceptance of the principle of episcopacy, the Bishop can at once give him his licence to celebrate the Holy Communion! If such a doctrine is to be accepted, it can hardly become a rule through the opinion of a small group of Bishops in one part of the Church.

But we must not lose sight of the plea that in making their concession the Bishops are but anticipating the union and are allowing now a liberty to be granted after the union has been inaugurated. This plea must certainly be carefully examined.

In the section of the Scheme for Union which deals with the initial membership of the united Church, it is stated that "the uniting Churches agree that all persons who at the time of the union are communicant members of any of the uniting Churches in the area of the union shall have the privileges and responsibilities of communicant members of the united Church, and as such shall be at liberty to receive Communion in any of its Churches." This last clause certainly means that Anglicans who enter the union will be free to communicate in any church in the area, no matter whether the minister is episcopally ordained or not. But this statement must be interpreted in the light of two other points in the scheme: firstly, that each of the negotiating Churches is to bring into the union its own customs and traditions, and secondly, that the Pledge definitely provides that the long-established traditions of any of the uniting Churches shall not knowingly be transgressed by authority. Commenting on this Pledge, the Unity Committee of the Lambeth Conference declared that "Among such long-established traditions of our own we number the Preface to the Ordinal, and therefore understand this Pledge to secure that the rule which the Anglican Church has inherited, that an episcopally ordained ministry is within our Church required for the due administration of the Holy Communion, will be preserved for those congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule."* I hold the view, therefore, that even after the union has been inaugurated the Bishops who go out from this Province into the united Church ought to teach their ex-Anglican brethren still to maintain this

* Lambeth Conference, 1930, Report, p. 127.

rule. That any Bishop will have the right thus to teach his people is both allowed in the Scheme and fully recognized by my brother Bishops. The present action of the Bishops, however, suggests something quite different from this; it suggests that after the union they are not going to stand by the Preface to the Ordinal, but are going to *encourage* those who were formerly Anglicans to act against the tradition they take with them into the united Church. The very fact that they do not stand firmly now for our rule of episcopal ordination, for those who minister the Holy Communion to the communicants under their charge, augurs ill for their witness in the future.

2. But it is not only on the grounds of principle that I dissent from the decision of the Bishops, but also on grounds of policy. It seems to me that in making this decision the Bishops have lost a valuable opportunity of helping the other negotiating Churches to realize our principles. There is in any case a grave danger that, in the natural and laudable eagerness for union, important points of difference should not be quite fully examined, and an agreement should be arrived at which does not altogether penetrate to fundamental principles. Certainly episcopacy and its consequences are a case in point. It is wonderful that the other negotiating Churches should be willing to depart from their own traditions so far as to accept the historic episcopate as the basis of union. But it is our responsibility to help them to realize what such acceptance involves. If the united Church in South India is in very truth to be built upon the foundation of the Catholic Faith and to come within the framework of Catholic Order, it is nothing short of a calamity that the Bishops should at this critical moment have obscured the issue. When it was our duty to stand by those principles, which are to be our contribution to the united Church, the Bishops suggest by their action that the episcopal ministry is not vital and that there is no essential difference between episcopal and non-episcopal ministries. How are we to teach our friends what the acceptance of the historic episcopate involves, if we are now to allow the members of our communion to slight one of the principles which has always accompanied it? The Bishops believe that by their action they are assisting the negotiations. I believe with sorrow that they have missed a great opportunity of bringing the negotiations to the point of a plain issue. But further, I believe this unfortunate action of the Bishops is a grave mistake not only in the interests of the negotiations, but also in its effect upon our own communion. It is a fact that the loyal and exact adherence to the principle of episcopacy binds us all together in the Anglican Communion. Different views and opinions about the theory and the consequences of episcopacy are held amongst us;

but we are able to work together and make our common witness just because we hold in common certain great principles, of which the episcopal ministry is one. To weaken our hold upon any one of these uniting principles is to undermine our fellowship. That is clearly the case with regard to the ministry. Nothing will so surely tend to cause divisions amongst us as action which weakens our witness to the priesthood or tampers with our existing rule. If proof is required of the concern which the Bishops' action has already aroused, reference need only be made to the impressive letter addressed to Father Shore on the subject by certain theologians in Oxford, a copy of which has been sent to every member of the General Council. Moreover, it is quite inevitable that the distrust of the scheme, which is already sufficiently widespread, should be further consolidated and intensified. It will be widely held, I fear, that the Bishops' action is proof of what has often been alleged—that this scheme is incompatible with Christian principles.

3. I dissent then from the action of the Bishops on grounds of principle and of policy; and also I hold that they have made a grave mistake from the point of view of expediency. Their action will not help forward the cause of a true union; it will retard it. If we cannot convince others as to the soundness of our principles by our consistency in observing them, we certainly shall not do so by our inconsistency. It would be far better to slow down the movement towards union and secure thereby a thorough understanding of the problems involved, than to hurry forward towards a union by setting aside principles and obscuring the issue. Moreover, what will be the effect upon the minds of our own people? There are many of us who have done our utmost to support the scheme even though we felt there was cause for great anxiety and misgiving. We have tried to reassure our friends when they were in doubt about it, and we have sought to commend it to the Church at large. But now we ourselves are in perplexity once more. What kind of Church is to be set up in South India? Is it in actual fact to be a Church in which priesthood is repudiated, Catholic Order held in light esteem, and all ministries are equated? If so, I for one shall be obliged sorrowfully to decide to record my vote against it.

I suppose that the difference of opinion amongst the Bishops and the Assessors of the Episcopal Synod on this issue represents fairly accurately what may be expected elsewhere. I cannot hope, therefore, to have a united Diocese behind me on this question; nor can I expect to find unanimity in the wider body of Anglicans to which I feel bound to address myself. It is a most distressing duty to be obliged to make a protest against

the decision of my friends. Every instinct leads me to desire to be of one heart and mind with them. Yet we must love truth even more than we love peace. Therefore at this time of grave difficulty I feel compelled to give some expression to the perplexity of my mind and the anguish of my soul, and to lay my case before those who have inherited with me the divine treasures of Catholic Faith and Order.

MARK COLOMBO.

THE FULLNESS OF SACRIFICE*

THE Bishop of Gibraltar has given to his book *The Fullness of Sacrifice* the sub-title *An Essay in Reconciliation*. The reconciliation which he aims at effecting is between those who are accustomed to think of the Eucharist as a sacrifice and those who are not. His hope is that when the true nature of sacrifice is understood, it will be seen that the controversy was based on a misunderstanding. His method is to trace the growth of that misunderstanding, and to exhibit it clearly for what it is. He is, as it were, treating the sick mind of Christendom by psycho-analysis, trusting that when the patient is brought face to face with the forgotten causes of its inner conflict, and sees them for what they are, he will recover.

Whether the treatment will be successful time alone can show. But there can be no doubt that Dr. Hicks has written one of those books which leave a permanent mark on the thought of his time. Those of us—and we are the great majority—who have taken for granted current opinions on subjects outside our own specialized lines of study, will inevitably find ourselves driven to revise our ideas as we read, and that in a direction in which we are glad to go. But the book is not easy reading: the style is often involved, and in his desire to be perfectly clear and convincing Dr. Hicks often defeats his own purpose by an exuberant redundancy of evidence and argument. I hope that the observations upon the book which I have to offer in this paper may serve both to draw attention to its importance, and to provide some pointers to guide the reader through its trees to a just appreciation of the wood they compose.

I

In studying the history of any doctrine, there are two different enquiries which have to be carefully distinguished. We

* *The Fullness of Sacrifice: An Essay in Reconciliation*. By F. C. N. Hicks, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. London, Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1930.

may ask what were the ideas actually held by different thinkers and try to discover the relations between them. To determine these and catalogue them with the greatest possible accuracy is the indispensable foundation of all further work. But then comes the attempt to estimate the abiding significance of the doctrinal development. This is a quite different enquiry, which may perhaps be described as trying to elicit the underlying logic of the matter as it was working itself out to fuller expression through the thoughts of the various thinkers. Unless the distinction between these two enquiries is kept clear, there is always the danger of reading back into the minds of men of old ideas of which they had no notion; and in reaction against this tendency students of narrowly historical bias confine themselves to studying the filiation of ideas and treat any further attempt at interpretation as subjective speculations corrupting to the historical conscience.

Now it is, I think, for want of making this distinction clear in his exposition of his thesis that Dr. Hicks lays himself open to misunderstanding and consequent criticism. His thesis is that a certain conception of sacrifice was the background of all religious thought in the New Testament, that this conception faded in later days, with the result that the New Testament came to be misunderstood for want of being interpreted in the light of its context of thought. This thesis he seems to me to have established, so long as it is clearly understood that the conception of sacrifice referred to is regarded as implied by the practice of the time rather than explicitly formulated in the mind of contemporary Judaism.

It will help to make the bishop's point clear if we begin by trying to state briefly in our own language just what that conception is. It comes in effect to this, that sacrifice is the method whereby reconciliation is effected between God's holiness and man's uncleanness, so that God and man can share together in a common life. For this to be possible, human life must first be offered to God, then accepted by God and transformed so that it may henceforward be lived by man in communion with God. *The complete transaction makes up the sacrifice as a single whole.* Thus the Christian sacrifice is a single transaction comprising: (i.) Our Lord's offering of His human life to the Father in perfect obedience and self-surrender, (ii.) the transformation of that life through death into a form in which it can be shared through the Spirit with men on earth, and (iii.) the process of sharing that life with His followers in the Church. The first "movement" in this single whole was consummated once for all on Calvary, and led to the initiation of the third at Pentecost. But without the last, either of the first two, or both, would be

17

incomplete as a sacrifice, and the last, so to speak, includes the preceding (which make it what it is), so that when we think of Christ in the Eucharist as sharing His surrendered and transformed life with the members of His Church, we are thinking of Him as performing an essentially sacrificial act. To use the word sacrifice for the first stage only would be as inaccurate as to regard a sermon as consisting in its preparation apart from its delivery. A "sermon" is a discourse prepared and preached; similarly a sacrifice is a life surrendered, transformed and shared; and as the preaching includes the preparation, so the sharing of the life includes its surrender and transformation.

This may be true; but it undoubtedly gives to the word sacrifice a meaning quite different from that which it bears in common use in the modern world; and even granted that the bishop is right in regarding the Eucharist as "sacrificial" because it is the earthly act wherein we are caught up to share in the heavenly life of Christ, it may be questioned whether to insist on the use of the *word* will not be more misleading than helpful in popular teaching. However that may be, we have now to ask whence Dr. Hicks draws his conclusion that in its special technical sense it should bear this wide meaning. The answer may be given in a sentence. The sacrificial worship in the Temple at the time of Christ was a system in which all three movements had their place and implied one another:

"We have found that Jewish sacrifice is, on the one hand, realized in practice under three main forms: the sin offering, representing the idea of the surrendered life; the burnt offering, that of the life dedicated and transformed; the peace offering, that of the life bestowed and shared. And, on the other hand, in the general conception of sacrifice, of which each of these are special expressions, there is a well-understood sequence of significant actions or stages. It begins with the approach—the drawing near, which we have in Hebrews—of the sinner with his victim. The second action is the identification of the sinner with the victim by the pressing of his hands upon its head. The third is the killing of the victim, not by the priest, but by him on whose behalf it is to be offered. Then, and not before then, the priest begins his work. He takes the life, voluntarily surrendered, into the presence of God, and thereby atonement—at-one-ment—is made. And the fifth stage is the offering upon the altar, and the acceptance by God in the fire from heaven which, so far from destroying, transforms; and the last, with which alone the sacrifice is complete, is the meal in which the worshipper is fed by the food from heaven" (p. 249).

It was the system *as a whole* which was fulfilled by Christ, and it is the perpetuation of this fulfilment that is effected in the Eucharist. In the course of time Jewish and Gentile sacrificial systems ceased to be the familiar context of Christian life and thought. Then there grew up the mistaken notion that the

first movement alone constituted the sacrifice, with the result that men had to choose between regarding the Eucharist as in some sense a repetition of the death on Calvary, or refusing to call it sacrifice at all. *Hinc illæ lacrimæ.*

"It may be said indeed that the description of the Eucharist as partly sacrifice and partly sacrament is the most concise as it is in some ways the most popular statement of the mediæval misconception of sacrifice. It can only mean that with the act of offering the sacrifice is complete. That would be untrue even if 'offering' were properly interpreted, if it were understood as in primitive times as following, with the pleading, upon the 'memorial' of the death. Even so, the true sacrifice only finds its goal and its culmination in the sacrificial feast. The whole procedure of redemption, beginning with our Lord's making Himself one with us in the Incarnation, and His sharing the conditions of our earthly life; continuing on the Cross, and in His passing through the Veil with the Blood with which He makes Atonement before God; issuing in His and our offering of manhood, His own and ours, and in God's acceptance and recreating of it in the heavenly life; is left, so to speak, suspended in mid-air, ineffective, unfinished, without the union of God with man in the reception of the glorified Manhood and the enfranchized Life which are the Body and the Blood. At every stage the Eucharist is both a sacrifice and a sacrament" (p. 310).

II

The first part of the book describes the growth of the Jewish sacrificial system into its composite whole of three movements. In the developed form the order of procedure is life surrendered, transformed, shared—sin offering, burnt offering, peace offering. But in the historical development, says Dr. Hicks, the order was the exact reverse. There was first the happy care-free stage when the sacrificial meal meant the sharing by man and God in a common life. But with deepening apprehension, first of the majesty and then of the holiness of God, there came also a deepening sense of man's unworthiness to participate in the divine life. The Burnt Offering came in to symbolize the fealty owed by subject to absolute monarch, the Sin Offering to symbolize the expiation owed by unclean man to Holy God. At each stage of development there was both gain and loss: gain in the fuller insight into the Divine nature, loss in the diminished possibility of happy communion with God. To understand the developed worship we must regard it as aiming at the recovery of what was lost: it aims throughout at the communion of the peace offering, for which the sin offering and the burnt offering prepare by clearing obstacles out of the way.

Now I understand from those who have a right to speak on the subject that this account of the historical development

cannot be taken as proved. Dr. Hicks has followed one school of thought as to the order of development, and interpreted the Old Testament in accordance with it; but other scholars of equal competence believe the order to have been different and the Old Testament evidence to be compatible with their views. This is a matter which must be left to the experts to decide, on which I can express no opinion. But I do not think either that Dr. Hicks' main contention would be vitiated, or the first part of his book rendered valueless, if he were wrong in this.

What is really vital to his thesis is the interconnection of the three movements in the Jewish worship at the time of our Lord, and the truth of this is not necessarily dependent on that of his particular reconstruction of the steps which led up to it. Although doubtless a true understanding of its past history would help to a deeper appreciation of its significance, the contemporary evidence for the practice of developed Judaism, and for the meaning it had for the faithful, is sufficient to justify Dr. Hicks' account of the matrix of Christianity, quite apart from his attempt to trace out the course of its growth in the past. The First Part of the book may thus be regarded as an essay in historical reconstruction, the statement of an hypothesis worked out with careful attention to detail in a manner which makes it a valuable contribution to the study of the subject. And it has a further value which only appears when one reflects upon it as a whole. It is a masterly exposition of the method of handling the Bible which the acceptance of critical studies has made possible for Christians of today, that method which seeks to find the revelation of God lying implicit in the course of history rather than in a collection of messages written by supernatural dictation. The treatment is scholarly, positive and constructive, and anyone who works through it with a Bible at hand, looking up the references and thinking them over, will find that the bishop has provided him with rich material not only for intellectual but also for devotional study of the Scriptures.

In this connection I cannot refrain from quoting a passage from Dr. Hicks' discussion of the meaning of the Divine Name, translated as "I will become what I will become":

"There is in this the double aspect of the personal God in which at length all the antinomies—infinite and finite, invisible and visible, beyond comprehension and intimately known, even eternal and temporal—find their solution. He is a Person—and the J document does not hesitate to be anthropomorphic—Who can enter into personal relations with His servants. He makes Himself known to them; they are in living touch with Him: they can speak to Him face to face as a man speaketh with his friend: that is one side. And the other is that He does not tell them what He is. There is no positive description of Him by any one of the

attributes by which we should ordinarily attempt to express our idea of God. It is only that as they continue in His service, allow themselves to be redeemed and shepherded and fed and ruled by Him, they will come to know Him more and more; or rather—not that they will find out more, but that He will become more to them. It is the Name of Revelation. It means, if it means anything, that the religion of Jahveh is to be one of perpetual progress. Moses knew Him; but Samuel knew Him better, and Isaiah better still, and Jeremiah and the rest, each in their turn. But to each the first, and the ultimate, truth always was 'He will become what He will become': you do not know it yet: there is far more that you and your successors have to learn" (p. 43).

III

Whatever may be the verdict of future studies on the order of development in the growth of sacrificial worship, there can be no doubt of the importance of the full-grown system for the understanding of Christianity. Here, in his Second Part, Dr. Hicks has done yeoman service in exhibiting the connection between the two. He has little trouble in disposing of the suggestion that the sacrificial worship of the priests and the Temple is to be contrasted with the "spiritual" worship of the prophets and the synagogue, and that our Lord was the champion of the latter against the former. After the trouncing he has given it, this theory should never again be able to lift up its discredited head. With this cleared out of the way, the road is open to explore the influence of the Temple worship on the thought of the New Testament; and the wealth of associations is surprising to those who have not followed out this clue before, and most illuminating. Once it is granted that the Peace Offering is the climax of sacrifice, and symbolizes God's feeding of His people, the influence of the Temple is seen to underlie the thought of the True Vine, the Good Shepherd, and the Bread from Heaven. The ramifications of this line of study are too wide to be more than mentioned here; the student must work through the Gospels under Dr. Hicks' guidance; but one typical passage may be quoted:

"The Lord's Prayer gives us, indeed, a conception of God which begins in the sanctuary. If we are made welcome as children in our Father's home; if we are made citizens or sons of His Kingdom; we lose the central meaning of home and Kingdom alike, and their force as changing our lives, if we do not begin by recognizing the Father and the King as before everything else the God Whose Holiness is the first secret alike of awe and of love, before Whom, as our Creator, we fall down in worship" (p. 158).

In the sacrificial ritual the victim is slain by those on whose behalf it is offered, symbolizing the surrender of the life to God.

Only after the death does the work of the priest begin, as he takes the blood into the Divine presence.

"The victim was killed in the old sacrifices, but never that it might simply be destroyed. Sin brings death as its consequence: the offerer's, or the penitent sinner's, slaying of his own victim means that he accepts that consequence; but he does it in order that, through the death to the old life, he may live to the new: else sacrificial death were symbolic suicide. The blood, in fact, needs to be dissociated from the idea of death. To us, with our modern associations, it is merely the evidence, the revolting evidence, of slaughter and destruction. To the men of the ancient world it was not revolting, but precious. It was life, once poisoned and misused, now released. It was more than that. It was the life which was at once their own and God's, the holiest thing, therefore, that they knew. And, once alienated from God by sin, in its shedding it was released. It could be taken to Him, and the life, once reunited with Him, could be, in a measure only, it is true, by sprinkling, but still in a measure, imparted to them. The Cross therefore looks both backwards and forwards. It means, as regards the past, death; as regards the future, since the blood is poured out, it is the surrender, and therefore the release, of life" (p. 242).

So "washed in the blood of the Lamb" means, accurately interpreted, "sharing the risen life of the crucified Christ," and "There is a fountain filled with blood, Drawn from Emmanuel's veins" may be paraphrased without loss of meaning as "There is a source of life eternal springing from our risen Lord." For He has been able to achieve what lay beyond the scope of the sacrifice of the old covenant even at its best and most developed. It could bring cleansing from the uncleanness of ritual transgression; but sin that (as we might say) was really sin, lay beyond its power. So the Divine life could never truly be shared; to the end it remained the height of blasphemy to drink the blood; so much so, indeed, that not only in the Temple, but in every meal the blood must not be eaten. According to all Jewish precedent the reason given by our Lord at the Last Supper for drinking the cup was a reason for doing almost anything else with it rather than that. Was He then, as shortly afterwards before the High Priest, uttering a blasphemous challenge to the Most High, or was He announcing the fulfilment of all the Scriptures and proclaiming the reconciliation of God and man? The answer of the faithful is their obedience to His command, "Do this . . . in remembrance of Me."

I have only been able to touch on a very few points in *The Fullness of Sacrifice*; but if what I have written should lead anyone to go and explore it further for himself, I shall not have written in vain.

LEONARD HODGSON.

THE LAST SUPPER: A CONJECTURE

MUCH has lately been written about what took place in the upper room on that last night: first, concerning what exactly was done and said in this world of space and time; and secondly, concerning the inner meaning of these things. This last finally comes and cannot help coming to be a question of what may have been in the mind of the Lord at that time: the deepest and largest question that can be asked, and so the most difficult to enter on. Any attempt to answer it can of course be only fragmentary and a matter, for the most part, only of reverent conjecture.

It is common ground for Christian theology that Christ intended to institute the Sacrament of His Body and Blood for perpetual use in the Church,* and it is within and around this that discussion has been carried on without ceasing for 2,000 years, and never with more eagerness and freshness than now.

But was this all?

May there not have been lying behind and far away beyond this the thought of the whole human race whom He had come to redeem and to unite to Himself? May not this have been the main thought? May not the fundamental intention in giving His Body and His Blood have been the giving of Himself to mankind as a whole? May not that formal act have been chiefly a formal ritual act, an effective sign or symbol as well as a germinal giving of this whole final bounty? Bishop Weston in *The Fulness of Christ*, pp. 116, 125, 127 ff., seems near implying this. The birthday of the Church, he says, is not Pentecost, which only "marks the full foundation of the accidental Church" (defined as "human persons united, in and through His Humanity with God-in-Manhood"); but Lady Day, when "the essential Church" began (defined as "manhood personally united with God, or God-in-Manhood" [p. 125]). And it is Maundy Thursday which "marks the real foundation of the Church": that is, of the essential Church. "On that day He had fulfilled His active ministry and finished the delivery of His message; He had set His seal to the conclusion of the preparation of the world for the manifestation of the Church or Kingdom."

He goes on to say that two movements closely bound up with His Person began on this day. "There was, first, His own personal movement from a state of humiliation . . . to the Central Throne. . . . And secondly . . . a movement of His immediate friends and followers from isolation of human weakness to the corporate life of divine power."

* This is not the place to consider exceptions.

"And we must be prepared to believe that, during this period of some fifty-three days, the Christ did actually accomplish hidden miracles in the spiritual world by His actions and sufferings; of which we are more accustomed to think as mere accidents in his Passion. It is nearer the truth to see in each incident the external symbol of some internal, spiritual act that was necessarily required to the establishment of Himself as the Foundation-stone of His Church."

Then he describes as one of such external symbols, the last Supper, preceded by the washing of the feet. "There (p. 133), as in a moment, the Church is established, founded, settled." Christ is pictured as performing a great, solemn, formal act of consecrating His Humanity to the service of mankind.

The Bishop's argument would perhaps have been easier to follow had he not been hampered by thinking in terms of substance and accident. But it is clear that for him the essential Church is only another name for the Body of Christ.*

I. It would seem that in studying the meaning of what took place at the Last Supper, sufficient consideration has not been given to the larger, deeper question which surely underlies the matter and should logically be dealt with first: that is, what do we mean by the Body of Christ?

What, first, do we mean by the word *body*?

It is a polity of what in a "natural" body are called tissues, and it is a consensus of functions. But whether natural or spiritual, it is essentially the organ of a spirit. It has many states in time, and many co-existing aspects, properties, energies, and functions. It is a polity of such for mutual help within and combined action without.† So it is with our bodies, small and exiguous spirits though we are. So it must be with what we know, very dimly and in part, as a small baby may know its nurse, of the Body of Christ. That Body surely is redeemed Humanity—whatever that may be—"the essential Church, God-in-Manhood," as Dr. Weston calls it.

It is one identical Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin; which lived and worked on earth; which was freed from material limitations by death on the Cross; which was taken up to glory at God's right hand; which there works for and by means of Its members on earth and—as we believe—beyond earth, giving Itself to Its members in the Sacrament of the Altar;

* "From the sacred Body, the essential Church, there flows blood" (p. 138). "It is sometimes hard to believe that the Modern Church is the identical Entity that was stripped and scourged and crucified. . . . Yet so it is . . . the very Humanity of Jesus Himself; even the Body that was naked, scarred, and crucified" (pp. 142-143).

† A corpse is not strictly speaking a body, but only "the withered stalks and shattered chrysalis of one" state of the spirit's organ.

which, on and before the Throne, pleads Its wounds as theirs by gift, offering each member and the whole of redeemed humanity—the Church—together with Itself in sacrifice to the Father.

Obviously there can be but one Body of Christ. But because it is a body and really One, it must have within itself differences. Some of these have been revealed to us. To our knowledge it has had in time many consecutive states, from the moment of the Incarnation to the Ascension; and it is even now growing until the final consummation. It has, and has had, also, co-existing aspects, properties, energies, and functions. Some few of these we know. The Body which rose from the dead was the identical Body which was born of the Virgin Mary and hung on the Cross, but different in aspect and property and function. The Body which at His Ascension Christ took into heaven was this identical Body, His Humanity marked with the wounds which He eternally pleads. The Body which He gave to the disciples at the Last Supper and now gives to each believer is that same Body, the identical living organ of the Spirit, but again differing in aspect and function. By the working of that function each baptized "member" of the Body is continually more fully incorporated into that state or aspect—we hardly dare say part—of the whole Body which we call the Church on earth, the same living organ of Christ's spirit (spirit-bearing body, as it is sometimes called) which functions here on earth according to His purpose, and continually augments the living Church beyond the veil; which—"Church triumphant"—again functions in ways which we partly know, earthward; no doubt in some ways also towards the innumerable host of the dead who have not as yet been brought into the Body. It also, with the "Church militant," functions Godward in the eternal sacrifice which Christ continually offers to the Father.

Just these glimpses we have of the One Body and its correlations. The wonder is, not that we cannot correlate more fully and definitely, but that so much should have been revealed to us of so inscrutable a mystery.

In particular, at the Last Supper, there is manifested to us Christ in what is called the "natural" state of His Body, imparting His Body in its "sacramental" state to men who were thereby in part constituted its "mystical" state. Something of the eternal mystery is shown to us in a flash: it is a collocation quite unique, so that even Catholic theologians ask, "How shall this be?"* We might answer that, just as when the Word took humanity upon Him, we naturally expect a wonder, a unique

* *E.g.*, see Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist: Index Institution of Eucharist, State of our Lord's Body, when given [at the Last Supper]*.

"miracle"; so, when He gave Himself to mankind, we should again naturally expect a wonder, a unique miracle. There should be no difficulties as to the revealing or functioning at that point of time of that state or energy or function of the Body which we call sacramental. Sequence in time belongs to our way of thinking. His working is eternal: the Word is Eternal: He was in the world when the world knew Him not. And we cannot say whether anything in it is at such and such a time possible or impossible, but can only sometimes say with the Fourth Gospel, this or that befitted Him.

St. Paul's description of the differences and interactions of the Church on earth (1 Cor. xii. 12-28) shows that he well understood that a body must be complex to constitute it a unity; and what he there says of the Church on earth he surely would have applied to the whole "essential" Church, the One Body. Indeed, in the deeper analysis which he has reached in Eph. iv. 4-16, taken together with Eph. i. 19-23 and other places, he almost seems to teach it in so many words: for there Christ is the Head of the whole Body which is "the fulness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled." The Christ, as Dr. Weston suggests, is not complete except or until the whole of redeemed humanity be gathered into His Body.

But, if a narrower view of the Church be taken, which does not include the millions of people who have died outside the Faith, what has been said above of a body and of the Church as the Body of Christ applies equally to that narrower conception.

If then at the Last Supper the ultimate end for which the Lord was giving Himself to mankind was in His mind at all, surely it must have been the main thing. Nothing less than mankind as a whole lay before His vision, and His main act and purpose in the impartation of His Body and His Blood was the formal making over of Himself to humanity: this was the main thing which was then and there done and accomplished.

II. Such a formal act of giving seems to be needed. At the moment of His Incarnation, historically speaking, He took to Himself human nature. He welded it indissolubly into His own Divine Person. Henceforth it was His. Whatever may be true of the eternal relations of the Eternal Word with mankind, in whatever manner He was in the world while the world knew Him not, there was one definite point of time when, in one little spot on this little world's face, the Word took flesh. Something happened which changed the course of the world; and the glory of the Only-begotten could be beheld.

But taking is not giving; and the Incarnation was essentially a taking. It is true that, looking back, we can see that by implication the Incarnation was a giving. Love could not take

without giving; and the condescension of taking is often a most real spiritual giving; so must it be most of all when it is God Who is taking to Himself His creature. Still, the Incarnation was essentially a taking, and a giving only by implication. And implication does not seem to suffice. So great a truth would seem to require an explicit act. Looking back, indeed, we seem to see that, so far as implication goes, the Incarnation itself and all that followed was implied in the creation of man. But implication is not enough, nor is a promise the same as a fulfilment. What was, as we think, morally implied in the Creation needed unfolding in a special definite act in the Incarnation. So did what was implied or involved or promised in the Incarnation need unfolding in explicit, distinct acts in time and space, which were stages in the work of the Eternal Word, and also at the same time in His Revelation.

His Baptism was such a stage. So, perhaps, may have been the Transfiguration. So, certainly, was the insufflation on the evening of the Resurrection. So was His Passion and Death, His Resurrection and the Forty Days, His Ascension and Pentecost. Each act was a developement in the revelation of God; each was a stage in the establishment of the New Covenant, an effectual step bringing about some new relation between God and man. Surely then, not least among these definite acts is there required some definite act, some particular moment in which He actually made the tremendous gift of Himself to mankind.

Was not this the main act at the Last Supper? Was it not an act greater, wider, deeper, and higher than even the gift to His Church of the great Sacrament of His Body and Blood? And how could the completeness of the gift be more completely expressed than by what He did when He took bread, and blessed and brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, "Take, eat; this is My body"; when He took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of it: for this is My blood"? If the bread in itself was a symbol, an effectual sign of His Body, surely that Sacramental Body then given to the Apostles was in its turn, and was meant to be, a symbol and effectual sign of His whole Human Nature then and there made over to the human race. Surely if the wine was an effectual sign of His Blood, His heavenly life given through death, so was the heavenly life then sacramentally given to the disciples an effectual sign and germinal giving of the fullness of His Divine Nature, then and there, once for all, made, through His Humanity, accessible to mankind for all eternity. In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. And in this fullness, human and Divine, He then and there, once for all, made over to mankind as a whole, Himself

with all His work and merits* so far as mankind was capable of receiving Him. That, and no less, surely is what was intended and was done at the Last Supper.

In His birth and life and work and suffering He had purged and renewed the human nature which He took in the Incarnation. In it He had finished the work which His Father had given Him to do, and in so doing He had perfected Himself in obedience, working through that human nature.

Now He gave back to us this human nature, cleansed and perfected in His Person, the firstfruits among many brethren, the forerunner. It was an eternal gift, made once for all, to be appropriated and made effective most immediately and perfectly through the Church which at that time He began to incorporate into Himself through the sacramental reception of His Body and Blood. It was a gift of Himself—the eternal Life which, as prefigured in the manna and in the feeding of the five thousand, was in itself without stint, only measured in each case by the need and capacity of each recipient and of the human race as a whole. It was the life of the vine, intensive. It was the life of the corn of wheat, extensive. It was the life of the leaven, growing and spreading from the nucleus, until the whole of the kingdom of heaven shall be “life in Him.”

It is commonly and truly said that “Christ gave Himself for us [on the Cross] that He might give Himself to us,” chiefly in the Blessed Sacrament. But surely it is also true that in the upper room He gave Himself to us that He might give Himself for us on the Cross. If He had not explicitly done so, there might have been room for an immoral theology of substitution. But in that formal making over of Himself to mankind there was nothing left out, nothing of what He had already done, nothing of what He would thereafter accomplish and effect. The definite deed of gift was needed to make plain that the sacrifice of the Cross was our sacrifice. He was fully ours before His Passion. Since the Transfiguration, which seems to have been a turning-point in His teaching of the Apostles, Christ had been preparing their minds for His Passion. He had “kept going on ahead of them” in hurrying to Jerusalem for it. He could say, “With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer”—*before*. Then came the supreme moment when, having finished His work and having perfected Himself as Man, He could have His desire; for He could, in one great crowning act, give wholly to man Himself, perfect God and perfect Man, henceforth to belong though His Humanity to the human race as the human race had belonged to Him since the Incarnation: a gift unstraitened in itself; straitened only in man’s capacity of receiving.

* As Sutton puts it, “the hive is given unto us with the honey.”

Much that comes earlier in the Gospel narratives seems to point to something in the upper room as the culmination of our Lord's earthly life and work, above and beyond the gift of a Sacrament. Baptism is at least as "necessary to salvation" as Holy Communion: yet how little is said of it in the Gospels, and how much is said in comparison leading up to the Last Supper. The feeding of the five thousand is the only miracle recorded in all four Gospels, and it is there made much of. In the great discourse of John vi. there is language which points to something which even the greatest Sacrament of the Church cannot exhaust. "I am the living bread . . . and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for *the life of the world*"; and much more. And the gift is spoken of as still in the future: not as already given in the Incarnation.

These and other passages in the Gospels would seem to indicate that the Last Supper as a whole should be set in line not primarily with the institution of the Sacrament of Baptism, but in line with other stages of the redemptive work actually accomplished in our Lord's life from the Incarnation to the Ascension, and especially with the events of His Baptism. Mediate, of course, every sacrament is a means for the incorporation of mankind with Christ, the Church being the formative nucleus of the corporate life of mankind in Christ. The first and second chapters of Ephesians alone are enough to show this. But what was to be worked out bit by bit down the ages had been made possible once for all by that one great series of Christ's redemptive acts.

Dr. Du Bose has always kept teaching us to apply to the work of redemption the truth that we can understand and appreciate a process only by considering it in the light of its end. The Blessed Sacrament is of course not an end but a means. So, perhaps, if the conjecture brought forward in this paper is worth considering, it may help our thinking about the Sacrament through viewing it in a larger setting.

That is to say, that what was in the thought of Christ first and mainly was the redemptive work of those few days and hours, and what this was to accomplish; namely, the gathering into His Body of the whole of redeemed mankind. Into the thought of His whole Body the Church, there was fitted in the institution of the Sacrament as an action or function within the Body. That is its setting. Christ is whole and entire in the Sacrament because it is, in St. Paul's words, "of the Body." We human beings are so imperfect as unities that we cannot be said to be whole and entire in (*e.g.*) our hand or our eye. Christ's unity is perfect.

Incidentally also it may help to unify our conception of the

primary reference of the Sacrament, which some theologians make to be the cross and some the intercession in heaven. There are three great steps or stages or elements in a sacrifice: (1) the choosing and giving over of the victim, (2) the victim's death, (3) the offering of it before God by a duly constituted priest. Historically, in the sacrifice made once for all by our High Priest, the first step or moment was accomplished in the upper room, the second on the cross, and in the third, the eternal heavenly offering and the sacrifice (not sacrifices) of the Mass coalesce. The Liturgy recapitulates the creative and redemptive work of God from the beginning of the world, and commemorates the life and surrender and death and resurrection of Christ until, in the central acts and invocation and words of Institution, it meets His presence in the heavenly places, being in fact the formal oblation of the sacrifice, eternally one with the first Eucharist in the upper room.*

Finally, if in its bearings on Eucharistic doctrine the argument of this paper would make God's gift to us come before our oblation to Him, this is only the normal order. "We love because He first loved us": and indeed the basis of the whole "Sacramental system" is that God's giving comes first right through life, ours being a response. Christ gave Himself to us that He might give Himself for us, and that He might then offer us to the Father in union with Himself in the heavenly places and at our altars. So it was in the drama of His life: and so it is now.

SISTER AGNES MASON, C.H.F.

CHARLES MARRIOTT (1811-1858)

THE most pathetic hero of the Oxford Movement, Charles Marriott, is the more worthy of remembrance in the "Keble" year, 1933, because, unlike the famous men whose names are household words among Churchmen, he has been forgotten, though he held the fort when Newman went out in the forties, rallied the scattered forces, and saved the Oxford Movement from complete collapse.

He was the son of John Marriott, a felicitous writer of hymns, whose "God, who madest earth and heaven" and "Thou, whose Almighty Word" are sung all the world over, and a polished and accomplished country parson. Charles learned his letters from the village schoolmaster, and showed a voracious appetite, while very young, for reading all sorts of subjects. His brother wrote:

* On this and other controversial matters which seem relevant to the main subject of this paper opinions are given perforce without their grounds.

I well recollect the satisfaction my Father used to express at his rapid progress in learning. His childhood gave promise of his great powers. He very early acquired the habit of thinking out subjects for himself; and used to form his own conclusions with great distinctness, and often with a degree of judgment far above his years, on matters of difficulty and importance . . . he showed singular aptitude in acquiring languages. When quite a child he preferred reading . . . to the out-of-door amusements which occupy the leisure of most boys: never happier than when ensconced behind the window-curtain (where he could sit unobserved and unmolested) he was devouring the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

To those early browsings in the venerable volumes of the *Encyclopædia* must be attributed his vast knowledge of out-of-the-way subjects. He seemed able to discourse on anything, and his retentive memory became an *Encyclopædia* in itself. "When taken with the children to see Exeter Cathedral," wrote a cousin, "while the elder ones were trying to measure the circumference of the great bell with bits of string, Charles was heard from behind to deliver (in his small peculiar voice) the oracular counsel: 'Take the diameter.'"

He was evidently a boy with a sacrificial outlook on life, because, though he neither spent nor saved his money, he never seemed to have any. When his parents left Broad Clyst, there was a loud wail from the old almswomen who lived near the Parsonage gate. They said that they should miss Master Charles as "he always brought them his money of a Saturday." His mother died in 1821, and his father four years later. The orphan boy of fourteen went to live with an aunt at Rugby, and when she married his father's curate, became his pupil in a Shropshire rectory until he was old enough to go to Exeter College, Oxford.

His immense knowledge was soon noticed there, and I am indebted to him for illuminating one of the minor problems of my life. It was remarked that it was strange that anyone should have thought of educating fleas, and, anyway, how in the world did they do it? Marriott looked up from the book he was reading, and said: "The first thing to be done is to put them in a pill-box, till they are quite tired of jumping." His memory was amazing. After reading a difficult poem by Wordsworth, of 135 lines, once through, and glancing at it a second time, he repeated the whole by heart.

Such was the intellectual quality of the man who was to become the office boy of the Oxford Movement. His immense gifts were wasted because he had the faculty of attracting all the odd jobs that arise from vast literary undertakings, such as the *Lives of the Fathers*. While he should have been creating books which would have become of permanent value to the

Church, he found himself burdened by an immense and unmanageable correspondence; visitors at all hours; miles (I use the word intentionally) of proofs; intricate indexes, which could have been compiled by lesser folk, and the tedious task of correcting the translations of others. Marriott and the *Lives of the Fathers* went together unto his life's end. They were a halter, however, that he bore gladly, for he had no life apart from the "Movement," and seemed to regard the office of Gibeonite as appointed to him by Divine Providence. He is a warning to those who have too many things to do, and thereby fail to use gifts fully which they alone may possess.

The immense amount of work which he accumulated was the more impossible because of his untidiness. Marriott's room was a ghastly, everlasting muddle. Books were everywhere. To sit down a visitor had to take a heap of precious tomes off a chair, and put it somewhere on the floor. His shelves were thick with dust. There were letters everywhere, and his fine memory for facts seemed to break down completely in his domestic circle. There is a delicious account of one of his entertainments in Burgon's *Twelve Good Men*. "An American Bishop . . . attended by three of his clergy, having crossed the Atlantic, would present himself at Marriott's door—who instantly asked them all four to breakfast next morning, and sent off cards by his servant to certain of his intimates . . . On his way from Hall or Chapel—or in the street—he would ask another, and another, and another. . . . Unfortunately he kept no reckoning. The result may be imagined. On entering the dear man's rooms next morning, whereas breakfast had been laid for ten, fifteen guests had assembled already. While we were secretly counting the tea-cups, another rap was heard, and in came two University Professors. All laughed; but it was no laughing matter, for still another and another person presented himself. The bell was again and again rung; more and more tea and coffee—muffins and dry toast—butter and bread—cream and eggs—chops and steaks—were ordered; and 'Richard' was begged to 'spread my other table-cloth on my other table.' The consequence was that our host's violoncello—fiddle-strings and music-books—printer's proofs and postage stamps—medicine bottles and pill-boxes—respirator and veil—grey wrapper for his throat and green shade for his eyes—pamphlets and letters innumerable—all were discharged in a volley on to the huge sofa. At last . . . (thanks to Richard's superhuman exertions) twenty of us (more or less) sat down to breakfast . . . I am bound to say that the meal was an entire success—as far as the strangers were concerned. They were greatly entertained

—in more senses than one. There was plenty of first-rate conversation, too. Good humour certainly prevailed universally. The delightful absurdity of the whole proceeding was so painfully conspicuous, and the experience (to strangers) so unique! . . . But oh, the consequences of such a *scrimmage* to the poor overworked student when the guests were gone, and the serious business of the day had to commence! Chaos must first be reduced to order—the letters must be read and answered—the proof sheets scrutinized and annotated—there would be callers to attend to—bores to encounter—engagements to keep. And long before *that*, the second post would have come in, and perhaps another batch of ‘illustrious strangers’ would have announced their arrival.

Such was the man who, broken-hearted when his beloved John Henry Newman went out, stepped into the gap and rallied the forces. He had studied everything: higher mathematics and astronomy; music and singing; poetry, biography, history, metaphysics, Irvingism, astrology, the habits of fleas, stars, and comets; logic; political economy; ontology; Utilitarianism; agriculture, and I know not what. One thing he had studied more than all else—how to be a good priest. So, when the cholera epidemic was at its height, he would be found far from his proofs and Fathers, at the beds of the dying. The account of the tired saint shriving a poor man at one bed, while a Roman Catholic priest performed a like task at the next, is one of the clearest proofs that the Oxford Movement was not merely an academic whimsy. All this, too, with health so frail that he had not been able to retain his post, in early life, as the first Principal of Chichester Theological College. That was as well, for Oriel needed him.

Possessed of some means, he made himself poor. To help Newman financially, after his secession, and perhaps to prevent him from establishing a Latin community in the cottages at Littlemore, he bought them from him, and established a printing press. He ought to have been prevented by his friends because, while it was certainly a useful asset to the Movement, the practical details were beyond his scope. One day he would toil out to Littlemore heavily laden with new type; another he would write hastily, to keep the press employed; a third he would over-order miles of paper, while all the time he should have been using his remarkable gifts in studious employ. It was a pathetic tragedy, and it killed him. . . .

His importance, at the time of the crisis, cannot be over-estimated, though he had no gifts for leadership. Burgon says: “Never was there a time when . . . calmness and intrepidity were more needed. . . .” Hugh James Rose had been for

three years removed from the scene. . . . Keble was far away at his country cure. Pusey was the only leader at headquarters; and to him Marriott opportunely joined himself. He brought to the cause every good and perfect gift . . . above all things, a well-merited reputation for sound Theological learning and solid Classical attainment—combined with what I can only designate as a truly Apostolic holiness of character—a most conciliatory, sympathizing disposition—entire singleness of purpose. But his prime qualification for supplying Newman's place was his unswerving loyalty to the Church of his fathers. . . . His view of what constitutes a living branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church soared far above the region of logical quibbles, intellectual subtleties, arbitrary definitions, irrelevant truisms. It was the view of Andrewes and of Hooker—of Laud and of Bull—of Barrow and of Bramhall—of Pearson and of Butler—of Rose and of Mill.

He died, after a long illness, on September 15, 1858, at the age of forty-seven. But for him, humanly speaking, the Anglo Catholic Movement would not be keeping a centenary.

DESMOND MORSE-BOYCOTT.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE Editor will be away from home for a month from August 5, and would be glad to be spared correspondence as much as possible. His address, in case of necessity, will be The Vicarage, Peasmarsh, Sussex, and proofs and other matter relating to the September number should be sent to him at that address.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR SIR,

Like Mr. Adams, I have been behindhand in reading my THEOLOGY, and I have only just discovered his letter.

Professor O'Toole does not, as Mr. Adams assumes, disbelieve in evolution; he is inclined on the balance of probability to accept that theory. He is concerned not to disprove evolution, but to show that evolution is not a sacred dogma which has been proved beyond all possibility of doubt. Professor O'Toole contends that "the evolutionist appeals to the imperfections of the geological record to explain the absence of missing links, but dates his fossils on the assumption that the geological record is reasonably complete."

On this Mr. Adams comments that certain missing links "did not last long, but rapidly evolved into more stable forms. The missing links would therefore never have existed in anything like the same numbers as either their ancestors or their descendants."

If evolution is true, Mr. Adams' explanation of the missing links is no doubt plausible, but if the question at issue is the truth or falsity of the evolutionary hypothesis, we are not entitled to assume those facts which are necessary to explain away the absence of missing links. What evidence can be adduced to prove that the missing links were ephemeral other than the fact that there are no missing links in the geological record? The facts are far more tolerant of the fixed-types hypothesis than of the evolutionary hypothesis.

And if evolution is not to be accepted as a theory which carries its own proof, one must surely admit it as reasonable that the geological record should be expected to provide far more intermediate forms than final forms. According to Darwin, evolution was a very slow process, the result of a slow and gradual selection of minute variations over vast periods of time. Millions of years would clearly be required to transform a reptile into a bird; yet we have no fossils of reptiles with rudimentary wings. The parent bird arrives on the scene with a fully developed wing.

In reply to Professor O'Toole's strictures on the vicious circle of dating fossils by the strata and the strata by the fossils, Mr. Adams writes: "A primitive type may persist alongside and even outlive certain of its descendants." Of course it may, but the case quoted was not that of

a primitive type appearing in recent beds, but of a modern type appearing in ancient beds. Equus inconsiderately turned up in beds which were classed as Miocene until equus appeared, and were then hastily relabelled Pliocene in order to prevent all danger of equus appearing before her alleged ancestors.

Evolution is very probably true, but the Christian who is taxed with certain difficulties of the Christian faith is fairly entitled to reply that evolutionists have shown themselves far readier than Christians to explain away awkward facts, to ignore apparent contradictions, and to assume the existence of the evidence which their theory requires. The Christian, at least, is not driven to appeal to the imperfections of the Gospel record in support of the central doctrines of his faith.

Yours very truly,
ARNOLD LUNN.

DEAR SIR,

Dr. Lowther Clarke, in his note on "The dead are raised up" (Luke vii. 22, Matt. xi. 5), and the miracle of the widow's son at Nain which follows in Luke, asks, "Have we explained the story away?" I think so.

Dr. Lowther Clarke begins by noting that in the raising of Jairus' daughter our Lord said, "She is not dead, but sleepeth," and would take the words literally, and omits discussion of the raising of Lazarus because "it has difficulties of its own."

And yet, whatever difficulties there may be in John xi., the Evangelist gives our Lord's words "our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep," and a little later, seeing that the hearers mistook Him, "He said plainly, Lazarus is dead." And why should not Jairus' daughter have been dead also? And St. John does not want us to forget the raising of Lazarus, four days dead, for in xii. 1 he speaks of "Bethany where Lazarus was whom He had raised from the dead."

Dr. Lowther Clarke, after saying that our Lord (Luke vii. 14) laid His hand on the *stretcher*, asserts that He "laid His hand on the body and health and life radiated out from Him, the lower part of the brain was still alive and could receive impressions" (through the wood of the *stretcher*?). But Luke says that our Lord touched the bier, and at the words, "young man . . . arise," the youth sat up.

Yours truly,
H. S. MILNER.

ELTON RECTORY,
STOCTON-ON-TEES.

A NOTE ON CHRISTOLOGY

A CORRESPONDENT of *The Guardian*, greatly dissatisfied with the positions of Catholic theology, put the following question: "If what the priests call God is infinite, and if Christ is God and God Christ, co-eternal, how could mortal man kill eternal God?"

The form of the question is open to grave criticism. As it stands it suggests a metaphysical riddle of which there must be some equivalent metaphysical solution. All the emphasis falls on the word "how." But Christian doctrine from the first has not been concerned with the word

"how," but with the word "who." If Christian faith in Christ had waited till such riddles as the above had been solved there never would have been faith in Christ. The riddles have, in historical sequence, been subsequent to the faith. It is open to anyone to say that he will not believe till the metaphysical problems are solved, but he ought to recognize that the Church has not encouraged the idea that the questions which emerge in Christian theology can rightly be discussed, still less solved, if they are approached as so many speculative difficulties. Further, he ought to recognize that as a matter of fact the faith of believers in Christ has been precedent to the answers they have given to such questions. Christians have not found that the answer to the question "Who" concerning Christ is dependent on their power to answer the question "How" concerning the possibility of certain events happening in the case of One who is both man and God.

Over and above this criticism further exception should be taken to the phrasing of the question. The suggestion of the words is that an inherent absurdity lies in what "mortal man" is affirmed to have done to "eternal God." Everything depends on the starkness of the contrasts. Viewed in such a light Christian theology would appear to have committed itself to a ridiculous mythology; but the mythology is an importation of the questioner. The Church in all the great controversies of the first five centuries was at pains to avoid all such mythological thinking. The doctrines of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Two Natures, while rooted in the original Christian faith in Christ, were worked out in such a manner as intentionally and definitely to preclude the kind of question which is at the beginning of this note. The coming of God into history did not involve the conclusion that God was swallowed up in history and became for a time no more than a unit in the historical process: this against the Sabellians. The coming was not of such a kind that there was no real taking of humanity but only the Logos wearing the outward appearance of humanity: this against the Docetists and the subtler theories of Apollinaris. The coming did not result in such a blending of the divine and human natures that the reality of the human nature was lost in the divine: this against the Monophysites.

Of course if it is assumed, *a priori*, to be impossible that God should personally enter into human experiences, the more human and non-divine the experience seems to be (and that reaches its climax in death), the more absurd it will appear that such an experience should be ascribed to God. But if this impossibility is not assumed, then the original relation of God to man in the Incarnation is a relation which may be extended through all the experiences of human life up to death. And no new problem arises at this point if the death is a death of violence at the hands of men.

The distinctions which the Fathers made with regard to the Two Natures followed simply and inevitably upon the original Christian faith in Christ as the Son of God. And it is more easily stated than proved that we can get on today, whether dogmatically or apologetically, without the Two Natures doctrine.

J. K. MOZLEY.

REVIEWS

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Vol. II. DISCIPLINE. Edited by Oscar Hardman, D.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

This is a volume of essays by various authors on the important subject of spiritual discipline, and we must congratulate the Editor on the variety of his symposium. We have here essays psychological, theological, practical, and the reader will be hard to please if he finds not something to his liking.

The volume opens with a psychological essay by Mr. Cyril Hudson on *The Growth of Christian Character*. Mr. Hudson's account of the soul's growth is based upon the psychology of McDougall, but he clearly recognizes the fact that the Christian doctrine of human nature cannot be confined within the limits of a school of psychology. His criticisms of current psychological theories are very able, and one particularly welcomes his clear statement of the essential difference between the Confessor and the Psycho-analyst, and his insistence upon the importance of sublimation in the ascetic training of the soul.

Mr. Browne-Wilkinson writes on *The Religious and Moral Training of Children*. His use of the modern study of child psychology and education is eminently sane, definite and practical; nevertheless one cannot help wondering whether the matter is really quite so simple as all this and whether the new methods are really producing more and better Christians than some of the despised older ones. Mr. Browne-Wilkinson gives very much valuable advice, but we miss the essential notes of adoration and sacrifice. There is much here that will help the child to "achieve selfhood," and that is good, but the aim of the Christian life is more than balanced self-expression; it is, as Mr. Hudson says, consecration; while the essence of consecration is, to quote Mr. Hartill, the *identification* of one's own will with the Will of God.

The essay on *Direction in Holiness of Life* by the new Dean of Rochester is interesting and valuable. Obviously an essay on so wide a subject can be but a sketch, nevertheless, into this sketch Mr. Underhill has packed the fruits of a careful study of ascetical theology and a lifetime's experience.

Prebendary Eck follows with an essay on *Direction in Spiritual Reading, Prayer and Meditation*, a vaster subject even than that of his predecessor. We are particularly grateful to Dr. Eck for his insistence upon the cardinal importance to the spiritual life of the love and study of Holy Scripture, a truth which merits more emphasis than it commonly receives.

Dr. Mozley contributes a weighty theological essay on the

Forgiveness of Sins, excellent in matter and presentation. His discussion of the nature of the eternal sin should be of real value in the direction of certain scrupulous souls.

The Editor intended to write an original essay on *The Church's Ministry of Reconciliation*, but, on second thoughts, substituted for most of it a quotation forty-six pages in length from Jeremy Taylor's *Unum Necessarium*, which he claims to be "a clear expression of the mind of the Church of England." As regards its clarity we can only say that, having read it carefully three times, we are still in doubt as to the precise conclusion the good Bishop wishes us to draw from his lengthy disputation, while its claim to represent the mind of the Church of England depends upon the validity of that conclusion. If it is intended to maintain that Confession is valuable only for counsel and comfort, and to deny any sacramental grace to absolution, such doctrine, though legitimate as a private opinion, certainly goes beyond the mind of the Church of England as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. So much seventeenth-century theology answers questions which we do not ask and controverts positions no longer held by anyone that, with all due deference to the admitted authority of Bishop Jeremy Taylor in many things, one wishes the Editor had adhered to his original plan for this essay.

Clear and practical instruction in the hearing of Confessions is contained in Canon Belton's paper on *The Practice of Sacramental Confession*, which should be of great value to young Priests and forms an excellent introduction to his book on the subject, to which he frequently refers. He gives a valuable list of books on moral theology, but he might with advantage have added some on ascetical, since there is some danger of the Confessor trained only on moral theology acquiring an exclusively forensic view of his office. We hope that in a future edition Canon Belton will clearly define conditional absolution, as his section on the subject is not altogether clear to the uninstructed.

In any work of Mr. Passmore's we may be sure of two things: first, that his real meaning will not leap at once to the eye, and secondly, that that meaning is worth grasping. His essay on *Classes and Types of Penitents* is no exception to this rule. The lazy reader should pass it by, for Mr. Passmore uses language like a whip to urge on our slow brains; if, therefore, one is not prepared to think one will merely dislike the whip. The reader who responds to stimulus will find much wisdom and some provocation in this essay, and he should not rest content with a single reading. We would especially commend Mr. Passmore's choice of Humility as "the sovereign test of repentance" and

"the crucial discrimen" between penitents: in this he has touched the root of spiritual analysis.

The sombre title of Mr. Hartill's essay on *The Obligation of Satisfaction for Sin* is an oyster-shell concealing a pearl of great price which the reader will do well to make his own. Mr. Hartill deals well and convincingly with satisfaction, suffering and reparation, and gives much wise advice on the assignment of penances; but, more than this, he lifts up the Christian life into its right perspective and shows it to us for what it is in the divine purpose. We hear much of the imitation of Christ today, but little of the work of grace in the Christian; much of our duty, but little of the willed identification of self with Christ which alone makes that duty perfect; much of the Church as an institution, but little of the supernatural life of the Body of Christ; much of the Priest as a sort of *tertium quid* between the soul and God, but little of him as the human means whereby the glorified Christ touches sinful man. But the Christian, the Church, the Priest and Christ are not separate units which react upon one another but never combine; by Baptism we are made one with Christ in the Church which is His Body, and "the life of the Church is the continuation of the life of Christ in which we are progressively more and more completely identified with Him in His work of satisfaction." The exposition of this doctrine is the pearl in Mr. Hartill's oyster.

The volume is rounded off by an essay on *The Reward of Righteousness*, in which Mr. Rosenthal expounds the glorious truth that the end of Christian asceticism is the joy of life with God.

F. P. HARTON.

LATIN WRITERS OF THE FIFTH CENTURY. By E. S. Duckett.
Holt and Co., New York.

In the fifth century the old order was changing throughout the Western Empire, and only one master-mind of the century attempted to forecast the future. Yet Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* is, as Troeltsch observed, the expression of a pessimism which looked to a future existence rather than to any earthly system of government for a solution of the ills of humanity. If the individual members of the temporal state became incorporated in the Body of Christ, well and good; but Augustine saw little hope of a transformation of the secular order in the apparently unending conflict of pagan and Christian ideals. The survey of the Latin writers of the century, presented in the book before us, shows how few are the outstanding secular figures either in prose or poetry; the Christian writers dominate

the literature of the period. The book opens with the poet Claudian and ends with Martianus Capella, the prose allegorist who in 430—if indeed, as some scholars doubt, he belongs to the fifth and not to an earlier century—wrote his famous *Nuptials* of Mercury and Philology, which had so powerful an influence on mediæval schemes of education. Claudian was a court-poet whose fate it was to write panegyrics of eminent people like Honorius and Stilicho, and whose one Christian poem, *de Salvatore*, while finely phrased, does not glow with the conviction of a genuine believer. His poems are valuable as historical witnesses of contemporary events, and are composed with remarkable mastery of the Latin metres, but we find more pleasure in reading his unfinished epic—or ought we now to say, epyllion?—on Proserpine, though not mentioned by Miss Duckett; for in this work he breaks through the conventional sentiments and adulations of a laureate and with a brilliant sense of colour and descriptive splendour depicts Proserpine gathering flowers in the meads of Enna and the forlorn figure of Ceres finding her child's half-finished embroidery in the deserted house. As the last of the classics, he is for ever significant; but his interest in Christianity is superficial and spasmodic. Less gifted are Rutilius, Merobaudes, and Apollinaris Sidonius—all poets, though the verse of Sidonius as literature cannot be placed in the same category as his invaluable *Letters*. We pass from secular poetry to sacred when we turn to the works of Claudius Marius Victor, Avitus, Sedulius, and Dracontius, and there discover that the Christian poet of that troubled age sought his inspiration not in the Apocalypse but in the Book of Genesis. The metrical versions of the Creation and the Fall which were composed by Avitus and Dracontius—not to mention the *Paschale Carmen* of Sedulius, which covers both Testaments—are the forerunners of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, and that Milton was influenced by them is on many grounds more than probable. Most of these poets belonged to Gaul, and we have a further group, Endelechius, Orientius, and Paulinus of Pella, whose verse reflects actual historical events—pestilence, oppression, slaughter, and other evils by which Gaul was visited, the cockpit of barbarian invaders, in a century of continuous distress.

Then we reach those masters of Christian prose, Jerome and Augustine. The author skilfully compresses into fifty pages an estimate of their personality, work, and influence, and merits the gratitude of her readers to whom the subject suggests volumes. The relations of both leaders are clearly recorded, as well as their respective contributions to Biblical and theological learning. Augustine gave expression to a philosophy of history

which went deeper than the mechanical belief of Polybius in Fortune, and profoundly influenced his disciple Orosius, who wrote a history of the world intended to prove that the evils of the fifth century were as nought compared with the horrors and iniquities of bygone ages. But Salvian, priest of Marseilles, thirty years later, expressed the opposite view in his work *On the Government of God*, wherein with a bitter pen he unsparingly denounced the evils of society and the corruption of the Church. The advance of monasticism to some extent justified his gloomy indictment, born as it was of a higher than the conventional standard of a holy life. The practice of the solitary life as taught by St. Anthony and the movement begun in the deserts of Egypt spread through the East, and in Constantinople was powerfully advocated by St. John Chrysostom. The *Life of Saint Anthony*, by Athanasius, had its analogue in the *Life of St. Martin* of Tours, by Sulpicius Severus, which became a "best-seller" of its age, while the example the saint set at Marmontier bore fruit in the monastery of Lerins with the influence of Honoratus, Eucherius, Faustus, and Vincentius, author of the famous canon *quod ubique, semper et ab omnibus*. But John Cassian is the chief glory of the movement with his *Institutes and Conferences*, full of commonsense and spiritual insight, as, e.g., in his study of *Accidie*, which Bp. Paget made familiar to the last generation in his famous *Spirit of Discipline*. Cassian's semi-Pelagianism accounts for his non-canonization in the Western Church, where "he is usually alluded to informally as *beatus*," while the Eastern Church has included him among the Saints of her Calendar. Such in rapid summary is the scope of this work, the result of the author's research as a student of Girton, Cambridge, prior to her appointment to an American Professorship. If the style is somewhat laboured and lacks lightness of touch, the volume has the solid merit of sound scholarship, and bears the marks of diligent and thoughtful research in the literature of a remarkable century.

R. MARTIN POPE.

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE. Edited by W. T. Whitley, LL.D.
With an Introduction by the Archbishop of York.
Student Christian Movement Press. 15s.

Historical theology has played a poor part on the stage of British scholarship, therefore something new is provided for British readers in this valuable volume, though, of the sixteen contributors, only four are Englishmen. But this book offers far more than a remarkable contribution to historical theology.

It is one of the consolidating enterprises of post-Lausanne activity. It contains the original researches of the Theological Committee appointed by the Continuation Committee of the Faith and Order Movement, together with a formal Report, embodying the results of these researches, presented to that Committee at High Leigh on August 19, 1931. It is therefore a practical step of considerable magnitude taken towards the reunion of the Churches. Its specific content, the doctrine of grace, imparted by the Holy Spirit, demands that it should be added to the list of books mentioned in Syllabus VIII. of *The Way of Renewal*, published by the S.P.C.K.

The Archbishop of York and the compiler of the Report both contend that such a survey has never been undertaken before. Certainly no such attempt to produce a body of historical theology has been made hitherto under Anglican auspices. Compression here necessitates concentration rather upon the Report than the sixteen admirable chapters which follow it. But so far as the former is a very faithful epitome of the latter, a survey of it will supply a fair idea of the whole book.

Throughout its history, the Orthodox Eastern Church, and down to Augustine, the Western Church, have not been greatly troubled by the idea of a fallen human nature and a vivid sense of the prevalence of sin. A vital change came in the West with the theology of Augustine, although Semi-Pelagianism continued to influence the Middle Ages. Augustine emphasized man's dependence on grace for salvation, which is granted to him without merit on his part. But the grace of God is actually infused into man, and enables him to produce good works which are acceptable to God. The latter part of this statement was strongly reaffirmed by Thomas Aquinas, who also completed the medieval theory of sacramental grace. The danger, never far from the medieval theory of sacramental grace, was that grace "could be regarded in practice as communication of power rather than a relationship with a Person." So the reaction of Reformation theology appeared. This in turn became scholasticized, and to Schleiermacher was due the re-establishment of "the conception of grace as the dominant and essential thought in Christian doctrine." *Sola gratia* again became *sola fide*, as in Reformation theology. Modern Western Christendom can be classified either under Augustine or under Luther and Calvin. The Eastern Church stands aside. It has no "sacramental theory," but lays stress on the operation of the Holy Spirit in the sacraments and in life generally. According to the Roman theory, grace is the infusion of God's love by God, and operates in man by the free consent of his will, and is followed by meritorious works. This

contrasts with the view of the churches in the line of Luther-Calvin, which denies that sanctification is ever complete on earth, or that man's works are ever meritorious, and stresses the sovereignty of God. On the whole, in the Anglican Church a theology of grace is as non-existent as in the Eastern Church. We may note in passing that the Report overlooks Article X., and that Dr. Griffith Thomas collected a number of passages from the Prayer Book on grace.* The Free Churches of the Anglo-Saxon world emphasize the mediation of grace rather by the Word than by the sacraments.

The Christian concept of grace does not appear in the Old Testament, and its terminology hardly appears in the Gospels. In concept and terminology it comes from St. Paul. In the concluding section of the book the Bishop of Gloucester makes this fact a text for his eirenicon. The disputes between the Churches have arisen from ambiguous interpretations of what was never explicitly defined, either by Scripture or the creeds; therefore, as the Report itself also suggests, in the matter of grace "each church might preserve its own tradition of theological expression without necessarily imposing it upon other churches," and "this would be no barrier to union." Then what is the barrier? Is not this rather the conclusion of tired investigators who, finding that the problem gets more entangled the more it is investigated, give the order "As you were!" hoping that a return to the *status quo ante* may be accepted as a solution? One thing is patently clear. This will not satisfy the generation which is close on the heels of our investigators. The handicap of all enquiries of this kind, of all doctrinal commissions, is that they are in the hands of men whose life-work is almost done, and from whom little that is creative ought to be expected. While they are able to analyze they cannot synthesize. The fact remains that if Jesus did not use the phraseology of grace, His life and teaching were full of it.

Of the able analytical papers which follow the Report only a word or two can be said, but they certainly ought to be read. Professor Gloubokowsky first denies that the Greek Fathers possessed a doctrine of grace, and then in his examination of individual writers, shows that it was there all the time. Professor Gavin sketches in a most valuable chapter the doctrine from Erigena to Thomas Aquinas and on to Trent and modern Roman doctrine. The Tridentine doctrine of grace was challenged by Ignatius Loyola. The teaching of Luther, Melancthon, and Zwingli is discussed by Professor Hermelink, and that of Calvin by Professor Choisy. Grace is not a quality poured into a man, but the turning of the angered God towards

* *Principles of Theology*, p. 178.

the sinner. The breaking-through of grace is a creative act of God, yet it is apprehended by the faith of man in a personal act. Calvin contrasts general grace, which is in all men, with special grace imparted through Revelation. Students of mysticism will find much to ponder upon in Professor Arseniev's contribution. With Professor Alvisatos we return to the Orthodox Churches, but to their modern epoch, and he notes that their theology has been influenced by Protestant as well as by Roman ideas. Methodist doctrine is described by Professor Soper, who points out that grace and faith are correlatives, *sola gratia, sola fide*. This idea is developed by Professor Wobermin, writing on Schleiermacher, Ritschl and other German authors, but it is doubtful whether the three New Testament passages quoted will bear the immanental significance which he assigns to them. Professor Adams Brown has not noticed that dualism is again receiving attention, as Bergson's latest book shows.* Dr. Vernon Bartlet sets up a strong plea for the relation of the doctrine of grace to the personality of God, on the basis of Dr. J. Oman's *Grace and Personality*. Vague abstractions can thereby be avoided. He notes that "grace" in Scripture is not connected with sacramental action or with orders.

One defect in this important book lies in the absence of any attempt to deal seriously with modern dialectical theology. That theology has patently influenced the chapter written by Professor Jundt, and there are signs of it in Dr. Hermelink's paper, but from the galaxy of distinguished theologians, Swiss, German and Scandinavian, who have adopted the Barthian interpretation of Scripture, Church Doctrine, and especially of Reformation theology, a contributor should have been selected for this volume. Some obscure points might have been illuminated. For example, Barth has probably put his finger upon the real weakness in the Augustinian doctrine of grace. The Pauline dialectic in Philippians ii. 12-13, to which the Bishop of Gloucester effectively draws attention, might have been definitely advanced as a second step to that achieved by Professor Manson, and we may notice that together with Professor Jundt, Dr. Headlam reveals the pattern of the dialectical mind. Again, the Barthian strain in Albert the Great would have been observed, and its vigorous source in Reformation theology might have been appreciated. This volume needed the precision and thrust of the younger dialectical school to carry its findings on to definite conclusions on the doctrine of grace such as are to be found in *Zur Lehre vom Heiligengeist*.

* Cf. also Professor Relton and Mr. Hanson in *Dogma in Hist. and Thought* (ed. Matthews).

While there is much to commend the suggestion that the doctrine of the Eastern Church, and especially its sacramental teaching, should remain undefined, yet the door is thereby left open for the entrance of Holy Tradition. Experience has shown that in doctrine Tradition can be as fissiparous and centrifugal in relation to other Churches as the sharpest of credal pronouncements. Yet this is a book for which every student and practical Churchman may be profoundly grateful to its distinguished authors, and to the Committee who selected them for their difficult task.

A. J. MACDONALD.

NOTICES

THE CATHEDRALS OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND. By J. Godfrey Day, D.D., and Henry E. Palton, D.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Members of the Church of Ireland, and indeed all who are interested in Church architecture, owe a debt of gratitude to the two bishops who worked together in producing this charming book. Something like it was long overdue, for although more than one monograph has appeared, as, e.g., Dean Bernard's *The Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, Dublin*, it is close on forty years since Fallow dealt with the larger subject. Since then much has been done in the restoration of some of Ireland's ancient cathedral churches, and as well there is today being raised in the industrial city of Belfast what in its completion promises to be a very beautiful building in the Basilican style.

It is not too much to say that this book is instinct with feeling. The writers have brought to their task that affection for what tells of zeal and devotion in far back days which enables them to write so sympathetically of what is ancient, and withal so critically of some modern "restorations."

The authors' Introduction is true to its name, and provides the reader with just enough about the style of architecture prevailing at different periods of Irish Christianity to enable him to enjoy intelligently what follows. It is a far cry from the wood and wattle building of some ancient Christian settlement of the Celtic period, or from the little rectangular, aisleless churches of a later date, to such buildings as St. Patrick's, Dublin, or St. Fin Barre's, Cork, but the writers enable their readers to fill up the intervening years without burdening them with many technical terms.

The story of its cathedral churches is in great measure the story of the whole Church of Ireland. Again and again we have reflected in this book the many vicissitudes through which the Church passed; yea more, we have the faith and courage of her children in past and present generations held up for our imitation. It would be difficult to imagine any Irish Churchman reading this book without realizing how precious is the heritage which has come down to him in the cathedral churches of his country. One other purpose, too, it will fulfil, and that is to awaken greater interest in those cathedral churches which lie outside the beaten track of tourists. The union of rural dioceses with one which had a city or large town within its borders, helped towards the neglect which came

upon several of the smaller cathedral churches of Ireland. Non-resident deans, too, who had no cure of souls, and who were content to preside by proxy over the meetings of their Chapters, oftentimes did little or nothing for the Church which gave them their title. Drs. Day and Palton show how in most instances this neglect has been made good in recent years. It is to the eternal credit of the Irish Church that, when Disestablishment was looming in the near distance and there were forebodings on every side of coming trial, she never lost her faith in her divine mission nor her courage as she faced the future. The most casual reader of this book will find in it example after example of this.

The illustrations, which include a reproduction of Mr. Orpen's water-colour drawing of St. Patrick's, Dublin, are thirty-seven in number and carefully chosen.

We would have wished the title of the book to run: The Cathedral Churches of the Church of Ireland, and that the authors had used the more correct word antiquary when referring to those of antiquarian tastes.

A few corrections will no doubt be made in a second edition. Country is a misprint for county (p. 63). Mallow is incorrectly spelled on p. 129. Midleton is the town near which the Cathedral Church of Cloyne is situated.

Beautifully printed and bound in red cloth, this book deserves a large sale and supplies a felt want.

CHARLES A. WEBSTER.

MORAL FREEDOM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By C. H. Valentine, M.A., Ph.D. (Lond.). S.P.C.K. 5s.

This is an able book serving a very useful purpose. Dr. Valentine, who has already well and truly laid the foundations of ethics and spiritual liberty in his earlier volumes, *What do we mean by God?* and *Modern Psychology and the Validity of Christian Experience*, here applies his findings to questions of obligation and conduct in these present-day orientations. The result is a valuable contribution to the reaffirmation of Christian moral doctrine.

Dr. Valentine refuses to meet the criticism of the tyranny of convention which is made by the new humanism by a hopeless *non possumus*. On the other hand, he points out the arrival of the new tyrannous convention of modernity. But he lifts the discussion of this issue on to a new level by his contention that "the argument which proves the insufficiency of all humanism, proves also the insufficiency of all morality." It is not given to morality to be self-contained! its foundations lie deeper than itself in the bedrock of religion. Moral freedom does not lie in regimented obedience to a moral imperative, but in "the glorious liberty of the children of God."

It is interesting to note that Dr. Valentine emphasizes in his own way the lesson set forth by Dr. K. E. Kirk in his book *The Vision of God*. The supreme need of this and every age is for a larger vision of God. In two memorable sentences Dr. Valentine sums up this lesson: "Morality can only be fulfilled when it is forgotten. It can only be forgotten and fulfilled when it is absorbed in spiritual religion."

Dr. Valentine's noble third chapter in this volume reaches a very high level of thought and expression. The foundations both of the moral order and its imperatives and also of the liberty wherein the soul attains its own proper good are placed within the reality of God. It is in the greatness

and glory of God that the moral incentive is to be found. The thought is theocentric because it grounds the knowledge of reality in the manifestation of the Son of God. It is because Jesus is the perfect Son of God that He is the moral ideal.

There are many incidental features of importance—Dr. Valentine's characterization of "the glorious": it intensifies out of the "numinous" and absorbs the "righteous." Again, the "greatness" of God as answering the demands of our moral and religious nature as well as our sense of the immensity of the universe. Few volumes are more calculated to help forward renewal of life and thought than this one, and on a clear page between the title and the contents these words might be placed: *I will run the way of thy commandments: when thou hast set my heart at liberty.*

F. W. BUTLER.

JAMES M. WILSON: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY, 1836-1931. Sidgwick and Jackson. 10s. 6d.

At sundry times and in divers manners Dr. Wilson wrote his recollections, which his two sons have selected and arranged. Three types are employed: large for Dr. Wilson's autobiography itself, medium for editorial narrative and commentary, small for the quotations which Dr. Wilson inserted in his MS. from letters, conversations, and his own published works. The finished editorial work is from the pen of the younger son, who thus concludes: "My task is now over. In these pages I have tried to illustrate the career of the young man whose future at Cambridge, promised so much, of the scientist whose active life of schoolmastering at Rugby seemed to have been brought to a sudden end, the Headmaster whose dominating personality held unchallenged sway at Clifton College, the Parish Priest and Archdeacon whose learning and breadth of wisdom brought a new and more loving spirit into the Church in Lancashire, the Canon whose activities renewed themselves after his seventieth year in a life of service to cathedral and city in Worcester, and the veteran whose last years were spent, widowed again but undefeatable by sorrow, in a serene calm of contemplation, with powers of mind almost undiminished and nearly ninety years of active life to recall."

He has done this well, keeping Dr. Wilson's own purpose in view, viz., to trace the story of his faith; and this is finally concentrated and explicated in a chapter on "The Growth of his Religious Thought." Dr. Wilson was constrained to such growth by the need of schoolboys; it continued for the needs of men. For himself he was unchangeably serene in hope. He looked far forward. At first he saw his appointed task was to clear away obstacles, to deepen parables into precise truth. Then he perceived the power in others of even mistaken conviction, and set himself to shape an expressive Gospel, such as rejected not parable but interpreted its truth and could be instructive of plain men "intellectually below the difficulties that beset the educated mind, while spiritually they were above them." But always he looked far forward, always he was ready for far greater transformation of parabolic faith in ages to come: "What a mystery the future is; my spiritual life goes on; the product of such infinite ages of past evolution; but in what form it is not given to man to know." He said that about the approach of his own death, but it might even more

profoundly herald his conviction of the Christ that is to be. Here perhaps is the peculiar magnanimity of this daring prophet. His own modesty—yet a frank modesty—and the son's very winning reticence of praise, perhaps obscure to some degree his greatness. Now and again Dr. Wilson speaks of Dr. Percival, and in some terse penetrative phrases makes evident how and why he stood out greatly above others. Sometimes the reader of this excellent book fancies that a companion volume, the Autobiography, printed whole and unadorned, would (unconsciously) reveal this one thing lacking.

Yet if such lack be here, what capital art is here too: inimitable episodes—*e.g.*, the boy Selous with his "tweaker" and his love of Nature and his housemaster's complicity, or that grand *peripeteia* at the Bristol lectures to rationalists: then finest drawing of character, especially of that noble pair Annie Elizabeth Moore and Georgina Mary Talbot, and her ethereal sketch of her sister-in-law Charlotte Sidgwick.

Indeed a fine life of a good man: "Wilson was like a Westmorland fell—speaking": *Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem*.

A. NAIRNE.

THE KING'S BOOK: OR, A NECESSARY DOCTRINE AND ERUDITION FOR ANY CHRISTIAN MAN, 1543. With an Introduction by T. A. Lacey. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This book, which is issued by the Church Historical Society, contains a glowing eulogy of the late Canon Lacey pronounced by Lord Halifax, and with that eulogy we warmly associate ourselves. Canon Lacey was one of the foremost scholars of our generation, and it was always a pleasure to read the lucid English he wrote: it was as transparently clear as his mind. We are glad to possess his learned edition of *The King's Book*, which contains a characteristic introduction from his pen. The backgrounds of the Reformation Confessions of Faith are ably sketched, and then comes a weighty summing up of *The King's Book*. Dr. Lacey holds that this book is of its own time and—in some of its parts—of all time, and he challenges our attention by his verdict that if it had been allowed a fair field, continuing and changing only as change was needed, there might have been a happier Church of England, and one not a whit more insular, than the last four centuries have known.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE RENEWED CHURCH OF THE UNITED BRETHREN, 1722-1930. By W. G. Addison. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The Church Historical Society has taken on a fresh lease of life, and the nine volumes in their new series are already indispensable to all serious students of the past. The editors are also fortunate in securing the services of authors who are winning their spurs. So far as we know, this is the first book which Dr. Addison has written, and it is one that does him credit. There is much scattered information on the history of Moravianism in our country, and with care and consideration the author has collected it and pieced it together. The outcome is the trustworthy volume before us. At Herrnhut, the Record Office, and Lambeth Palace Library he has diligently searched among matter almost completely forgotten. Not only has he industry but he has also the signal merit of beginning at

the origin of the movement in Herrnhut and coming down to the present day. Good as is the first chapter on the renewer of the Old Brüder Kirche, the third, on the origins and early development of the English province, is even better. Some of the information given we already knew, though we knew it in disjointed fashion, and some we did not know at all. In this third chapter the wider aspects are never forgotten, and we felt particularly pleased with the contrast set up between the group life and the Sovereign State. There is nothing said about Althusius, the father of the Group conception, and there is much said about Hobbes, and the author helps us to realize how strongly this group view of the Moravians determined their outlook. Many will read with keener interest the possible relationship between the *Unitas Fratrum* and the Church of England. There is a succinct account of the renewed *Unitas* as a *via media*, and the state of negotiations at this moment is duly analyzed. There are useful appendices on such matters as the Tropus scheme, when Zinzendorf and the English bishops entered into negotiations in 1740-52, and on the La Trobe-Loretz correspondence.

R. H. MURRAY.

A MONTH'S RETREAT FOR RELIGIOUS. By The Rev. W. H. Longridge, S.S.J.E. S.S.J.E., Oxford. 15s.

The demand for such a book as this is obviously limited, though others, particularly priests, could make valuable use of most of the material. Each community has its own peculiar ethos, not least the S.S.J.E., but Fr. Longridge deals with the essentials common to all expressions of the Religious Life.

The Ignatian Exercises are only one method of Retreat and not necessarily for all the best, but they do possess an unrivalled power of making the retreatant face the real issues. They put before him with alarming directness the purpose of his creation, the call of Christ to him, the challenge of the Cross, and the power of the Risen Life. The effect is cumulative. English people more than most ought to be able to appreciate the stern practicality of St. Ignatius, though his logic might carry them further than they would wish to go. Father Longridge is not afraid to press it. "Are we dying with Christ to the world? Are we more dead to it than we were a year ago?" Yet he urges too the attractiveness of Christ, and the joy of following Him: "A vocation is in truth nothing else but a vision of Jesus."

The Exercises are left to make their own appeal. Fr. Longridge adapts, supplements, fills in outlines, but retains the austerity of their presentation. Modern Biblical and psychological problems cast no shadows.

One notices, however, certain departures from St. Ignatius' method. He kept his meditations and instructions rigidly separate: here they are often mingled. St. Ignatius made the retreatant repeat the same meditation, sometimes more than once in a day. Here this is not done, though inevitably much repetition occurs in the course. Nor do we find the somewhat artificial application of the five senses, which the saint taught.

Fr. Longridge's adaptations of the Exercises for priests and laymen have already proved their value: Religious should find their meditations at least as profitable.

HUBERT NORTHCOTT, C.R.

GUIDE TO FAITH AND WORSHIP. By H. Erskine Hill. S.P.C.K. 2s.

This little book, by the Provost of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Aberdeen, contains a wonderful amount of theoretical and practical guidance within a small compass. Like other similar manuals, it contains directions for private prayer and attendance at Holy Communion, together with brief instructions on the Christian faith. It also includes (as most other books of the kind do not) a useful weekly scheme of intercession, based on the Lord's Prayer, and some very valuable guidance in the art of meditation, illustrated by seven specimen meditations. It is, perhaps, rather above the mentality of the ordinary uneducated confirmation candidate, but it seems to be almost the ideal thing to put into the hands of boys and girls of the public school type. Nor will it prove inadequate for the average undergraduate. We believe that it will meet a real need.

L. DEWAR.

THE NATURE OF EVIL. By Radoslav A. Tsanoff, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 15s.

Professor Tsanoff follows up his philosophic study of the Problem of Immortality with this on the Nature of Evil. Throughout it is an historical account of the attitude of religions and philosophies to judgments of value; and as Green expressed it: "Our ultimate standard of worth is an ideal of *personal* worth. All other values are relative to value for, of, or in a person." The riddle of the painful earth as it posed itself to Job, to Augustine, to St. Thomas, to the comfortable optimists of the eighteenth century, to the rebels who followed—Leopardi, De Vigny, Byron—and so to the spokesman of philosophic pessimism—Schopenhauer and his later disciples—this is the author's theme, and the important systems of thought stand out clearly as they succeed one another; the exposition, moreover, is brightened by quite vivid accounts of the lives of the thinkers whose systems he is considering.

Having covered so wide a field he concludes with a massive chapter in which he expounds his own view of Evil, which he terms gradational. "Evil is that ever-present side or factor in the actual world, by resistance to which a possible worthier side of nature affirms itself, and gains reality through attainment. This contest is at the heart of things; it has neither beginning nor end, and it makes our world significant and stirring." Or, as one may conclude from this chapter, Evil is the temptation to yield to the seductions of the floor of the House of Life below the one into which we have arrived.

For a well-arranged study of optimism and pessimism Professor Tsanoff may be commended.

W. J. FERRAR.

CONSTITUTIONAL EPISCOPACY. By C. E. Douglas. The Faith Press. 3s.

A group of physicians is assembled, not exactly round a sick-bed, but to consider the case of a professional athlete who is troubled with some queer symptoms. It is not thought at all likely that the patient will die, but it is not certain that he is equal to the exceptional strain imposed by his vocation. The patient is the Church of England. What can be done? Some say that our theology is all over the place, and what we need is the pure milk of the Word, or the faith once delivered to the saints—something, in fact, which is quite plain and tangible. Others reply that

we are still too much entangled in the toils of dogma, and the remedy is greater intellectual freedom. Others find a moral cause for whatever infirmities there be, and preach repentance.

Mr. Douglas has something in common with all these physicians. There is evidence in his book of attachment to doctrinal tradition, of a love of freedom, of a concern for ethics. But he appears here as a constitutionalist, and his primary diagnosis of the disease is Byzantinism. Byzantinism is the system which we inherit from that successor of Diocletian whom we call Constantine the Great, and from that Council of Chalcedon which completed the process of unification by creating territorial dioceses everywhere. Except here and there, beyond the Eastern Empire, for example, and in our country down to the Synod of Whitby, there was a pyramid. At the top there was in the fourth century Constantine, in the ninth century Charlemagne, in mediæval England the King. We hear curiously little of the Pope, and much of the Byzantine Regalism of the pre-Reformation English Church.

Since the seventeenth century the power of the King in the State has almost disappeared. The King has also ceased to be in any effective sense the Supreme Governor of the Church. The Bishops have "picked up, as individual 'princes,' the mantle of the Byzantine sacred monarch." To this, though not to this only, our lack of power is due. Byzantinism, of which Cranmer was a great example, whereas Gardiner was the "typical Anglican," has driven many to Rome and to sectarianism. If we could shake it off, we should be the free Church of the free English people. We must read Archbishop Ussher's *Reduction of Episcopacy unto the form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church*, and we must not be above taking a hint from the Church in the Channel Isles. Mr. Douglas has written an odd book, containing at once too much history and not enough, but containing also a great deal of very sound logic. It is a book that ought to be read.

S. C. CARPENTER.

PERSONAL PROBLEMS OF CONDUCT AND RELIGION. By J. G. Mackenzie.
Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

We can cordially recommend this book to all clergy and teachers of religion. The writer has had a very wide experience in dealing with cases of moral difficulty, spiritual perplexity and doubt. In this book he gives a series of actual instances and his own wise suggestions in dealing with them. On every page will be found that large-hearted and genuine sympathy with human frailty and temptation which is the invariable outcome of intimate contact with struggling souls. The chapter headed "An Adolescent Problem" will be of value to all who have the care of children—whether as parents, teachers or clergy. Mr. Mackenzie is a Congregationalist Minister; he writes as one thoroughly versed not only in psychology but also in moral theology. His outlook is Catholic in the best sense of that cruelly misused term.

C. C. J. JAMES.

RELIGION: ITS BASIS AND DEVELOPMENT. By H. Montague Dale, B.D.
Allenson. 5s.

This is an attempt to deal with a vast subject in small compass, in simple fashion, and in close dependence upon writers from whose works numerous quotations are drawn. Almost inevitably, therefore, it is

found to consist largely of short paragraphs providing miscellaneous information in a series of rapid transitions. But, while it cannot be said to represent a fresh contribution to the comparative study of religion, it will probably be a real help to those whom the writer seems to have had in mind. There are still, it is to be feared, a number of Christians who have dared neither to admit the possibility of truth being found in other religions nor to allow the introduction of the principle of development into any of their thoughts about religion. Canon Dale here undertakes to help them to do both these things, and in so doing to take a wider and truer view of religion in general and to become better Christians.

O. HARDMAN.

SCIENCE AND REVELATION. By Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d.

This is the sort of book a Roman Catholic writer often does so well and, except that we do not agree that a decision confirmed by the Pope as head of the Church is final, there is nothing in it that we cannot make use of, or indeed, that might not have been written by an English Catholic equally well.

It is meant, I take it, to tell people what all this recent talk of "religion and science" is about, and to reassure those who might be disturbed by it. The author first picks out some of the chief ideas of various recent popular works by Professors Eddington and Jeans, of "that ponderous but fascinating tome, the *Science of Life*," and of the broadcast lectures on *Science and Religion*, which he contrasts with those of the Catholic conception of religion. He then, in a second chapter, discusses the recent development of Natural Science. In a third he considers the relations, rather than the conflict, of religion and science, since, "seeing that religion is primarily concerned with the highest and the fullest form of being, whereas physical science is concerned with the lowest form of being, in which there is found neither life nor intelligence, it is scarcely likely that there will be either coincidence or conflict save here and there." In the last chapter he considers Biology or the Science of Life where the subject-matter is more clearly connected with religion, recognizing that evolution, while it is a working hypothesis accounting for much, does not account for everything and, in particular, cannot explain the origin and nature of the soul.

If there is nothing, perhaps, particularly new in what he says, the way he says it is, if not new, just the very way things need to be said. He puts clearly and with sure knowledge things we think people know when, as a matter of fact, they do not. "The Church is neither a Delphic oracle nor an automatic machine." Science "used to mean knowledge in the strict sense of the term—nowadays we are wont to use the term, not as synonymous with philosophy in one or other of its branches, but as synonymous with knowledge by acquaintance, provided that knowledge be systematized and co-ordinated under general laws." So it is regarded as "concerned merely with the phenomenal world." "Science, become critical on its own procedure, has become more moderate in its criticism of religion." "No one denies that in the Early and Middle Ages Christians believed many things that have since been shown to be false. But they did not believe these things because they thought they had been revealed, but because they were so taught by the scientists of their day." "Be-

cause Huxley made these egregious mistakes (about free will) we do not esteem him the less as a scientist, because in making them he was not talking science, but was indulging in philosophical speculation foreign to science proper." "It is in relation to us and the things that are in it that the Universe progressively unfolds." "If random variations (in the jump of the electron) do lie at the root of change . . . every event, in so far as it involves novelty, is in fact a fresh creation." "Physical reality is not mere thought, though it is meaningless apart from thought." "The fact that people have formed false ideas of God does not dispose of God's existence, nor does the fact that belief in God satisfies deep-rooted human instincts . . . prove that God is but the product of imagination or thought." "If we are to have a religion we must face the consequences and be prepared to think them out. This means a theology."

Other interesting points are raised. The author suggests that the hesitation of the Roman Church to accept evolution is not altogether due to traditional ideas of the first chapters of Genesis, as they (with the exception, perhaps, of the creation of Eve) suggest it, while it is, of course, involved in the Church's traditional teleology. It is rather, he suggests, from her rigorous training in the use of logic that she is unwilling to accept it as more than a working hypothesis accounting for much, but leaving unexplained divergencies and survivals. Moreover, if applied to the origin of the soul, all morality goes. "Man will be regarded as a mere animal and will behave as such." But, surely, all it does is to say that animals have undeveloped souls and that the whole creation may therefore share in some way in man's redemption. It may raise the animal creation, but it cannot degrade man.

C. F. ROGERS.

A LITTLE PSALTER. Arranged by Canon Sydney Cooper. S.P.C.K.
2s. 6d.

To many, the inclusion of Prime in the 1928 Revision seemed to be merely a method of finding an obscure home for the *Quicumque vult*. This little book realizes that for school and family use in future, Prime and Compline can rightly and happily take the place in daily use of shortened forms of Matins and Evensong, or of any more shapeless devotion. Could schools but see and practise this, good service would be rendered to the strength and coherence of English prayer, maintaining it upon liturgical foundations in accordance with our true tradition.

But Prime and Compline are invariable offices (almost) as they stand in the new Prayer Book. Canon Cooper renders them variable by a considered rota of Psalms and a seasonal provision of antiphons. The arrangement of the latter is so simple of reference that it could not give a private school boy a moment's difficulty. This is a triumph indeed. So far as the psalms are concerned, the compiler has cast out both cursing passages and those dealing with Israelitish history; and maintained an average length of twenty verses per office. "The frequent cuts and occasional corrections" have been admirably done, and have swept away the considerable prejudice of the reviewer. The gains, for instance, for school use of removing verses 10 to 24 of Psalm 136 is convincing; it becomes at once a psalm easy to love at the earliest age.

We hope schools will hear of this book, and experiment with it in use.

E. MILNER-WHITE.

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER: APOSTLE OF THE EAST. By Margaret Yeo. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

It is perhaps the greatest compliment that can be paid to the author of this life of St. Francis Xavier, completely to forget her in the compelling interest of the man whom she portrays. She does not set out to make a critical study, but simply to give the story of a life, and from the pages of Miss Yeo's book St. Francis Xavier shines out as if he lived before the reader's eyes. The flaming devotion which led him to join the Company of Jesus, under his friend and spiritual father "Master Ignatius," and the apostolic labours of his missionary life, are so described that even the coldest reader must warm at their fire.

There have never been wanting critics of the missionary methods of this great Saint, such as the burning zeal that must always move on to plant the Church in some remoter place, rather than stay long enough to cherish a tender growth; or the mass baptisms, after a preparation involving nothing more than a few set answers, learnt parrot-wise. We are wiser than St. Francis, we think. Maybe. But shall our wisdom work more mightily for God than did his holiness? Of that we are not so sure.

To the endurance and unbroken courage which were his natural inheritance Francis added the joy and peace, the love and longsuffering, such as belong only to the saints. His life after he left Europe was one of unbroken hardships and sufferings, and through them all Miss Yeo shows him to us gay and attractive, gentle and patient, witnessing, by his life even more than by his words, to the perfections of Jesus, his Lord.

It is not possible in so short a space to say anything of his great journeys; of his sorrow over men's sins, and the blindness of those who would not receive his message.

We recommend all who can to read Miss Yeo's book.

E. Fox.

MARRIAGE CONDITIONS IN A PALESTINIAN VILLAGE. By Hilma Granqvist. (*Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, III., 8.) Helsingfors, 1931. 1a. 80.

There can be no doubt that a woman is best fitted to make enquiries into the intimacies of family life in a Muhammadan country, and Miss Granqvist, as this study proves, possesses all the necessary qualifications. Following the method recommended by Rivers, she has made an intensive genealogical study of one small unit, the village of Artas, south of Bethlehem, on the edge of the desert of Judea. The result is a tabulated statement of all the marriages of 199 men and 65 women of the village during the last century. Miss Granqvist lived in Artas for a couple of years and got her information at first hand. Her method was to interrogate certain women for several hours every day, and to take down their statements in Arabic. The book largely consists of a translation of these statements, to which the author has added here and there some valuable observations of her own. Inevitably, a certain dullness looms over the book; exact it is, but I for one would gladly dispense with the statistics in exchange for a clear, consecutive account of these matters; detailed proofs could be relegated to footnotes. However, a great many interesting facts are given which will correct Western ideas of Eastern marriages and incidentally throw light on the Old Testament. Many of the latter are indicated

by the author—*e.g.*, the intense dislike of marriage outside the tribe (*cf.* Gen. xxviii.), and service for a wife (Gen. xxix.). The prevalence of the idea of purchase is most suggestive in relation to the Old Testament idea of redemption.

Two translations of the same phrase are given on pp. 26 and 75; the second is right, literally "Travel by night and I am thy moon," but the meaning surely is, "You can't get away from me!" I notice, too, that *ibn ḥalāl* is rendered "son of righteousness." I believe that modern Syrians do use this phrase when they mean "an honest man"; but the context shows that the ancient meaning is still retained here. The *ibn ḥalāl* is the man who releases a person from a state of taboo, or discharges a person from an obligation. Here the sheikh of Bethlehem released an unfortunate woman from death as Jesus did in John viii.

The writer's thoroughness cannot be too highly praised. But why no Index?

A. GUILLAUME.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE CURE OF DISEASE. By George S. Man, D.Litt. Allenson. 5s.

This book is a welcome addition to the steadily growing literature on the subject of the relation of Religion to Health. For two reasons: first, because the writer has the somewhat unusual qualifications of being both a Presbyterian minister and also a trained doctor, and secondly, in view of the fact that he deals with his subject with great breadth of outlook and an entire absence of prejudice. For example, the mediæval cultus of relics and the modern centres of faith-healing, such as Lourdes, and in the writer's own native land, Carfin, are given sympathetic consideration.

There is a simple and concise account of the connection between religion and medicine from the earliest pagan times, of our Lord's ministry of healing, of the Apostolic gift, and of the efforts of the Church to restore health before the development of mediæval science in its present sense. The conclusion is a stirring plea for closer co-operation between clergy and doctors. It would seem to us that at the present time the greatest service the clergy can ordinarily render to the sick is to give them careful spiritual preparation for the doctor's treatment, thereby providing the necessary disposition towards recovery to be expected at the hands of God through the physician.

It is indubitably true that there are many authenticated examples of apparently incurable ailments overcome through faith. But the fact remains that of the vast number of eager, hopeful, faithful persons who either visit Lourdes or attend healing services, pathetically few are permanently cured. To reply that they are given spiritual "uplift" is to evade the point. Those whom our Lord healed can have had much less preparation for the receiving of His help. We all realize that the Church ought to be able to heal, but at present the secret of the recovery of this power seems hidden. The difficulty of closer co-operation between clergy and doctors is that many doctors need to be converted to a belief in the efficacy of the minister's services as a fellow worker.

C. C. J. JAMES.

BOOK NOTES

Pastoralbrevens Äkthet (The Genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles), by C. Thörnell (Eranos' Förlag. Gothenburg. 1931), consists of an Introduction and a Commentary on the three Epistles, written from a philological point of view. The author, who is a Classical Professor at Uppsala, seeks to prove these Epistles to be Pauline on the ground of turns of phrase, tricks of style, use of conjunctions, and so on. But, in spite of all the pains which he takes, the effect is singularly unconvincing. One cannot help suspecting that the tests actually applied are really so loose that they might be made to yield almost any desired result; nor does anything that the author says remove the difficulty which every reader feels, of correlating the style of these writings with that of the acknowledged Epistles of St. Paul.

A. G. HEBERT.

Outlines of Teaching Sermons for a Year. Edited by C. E. Hudson, with foreword by the Archbishop of York, and an introduction by the Bishop of St. Albans. Allen and Unwin. 2s. These thirty-two skeleton sermons, prepared by a sub-committee dealing with Adult Religious Education in the Diocese of St. Albans, are divided into four sections: Grounds of Belief in God, the Old Testament, the Life of our Lord, Life in Christ. The scheme is a unity, intended as a preliminary guide to the parish priest in the preparation of his teaching sermons. It is carefully constructed, but one fears that it may be too useful for the "clergyman who turns to it desperately on a Saturday night in order to find a couple of sermons for the following day," and insufficiently developed to become a basis for careful study of the problems it raises.

The English Cardinals. By G. C. Heseltine. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. It is difficult to see what useful purpose this book can serve. Into 200 pages are packed sixty biographies of English, American, and Colonial Cardinals of the last 700 years. It is not detailed history, and the author's Roman bias prevents its being a reliable book of reference: on page 137 we learn that Cardinal Allen's English patriotism caused him to support Philip of Spain's project for the invasion of England. Doubtless for those without historical sense the book will have its value.

Saint Hugh of Lincoln. By Joseph Clayton. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s. This is an attractive book about one of the most attractive of the Saints. Mr. Clayton is an enthusiastic admirer of St. Hugh. His is not a full historical work as is Fr. Thurston's book; but it is a very readable and reasonably accurate biography. The author's enthusiasm, perhaps, leads him to obtrude his own judgments into the biography; his faith in miracles is naïve; and his style is somewhat involved and rhetorical. But the book is interesting, and it gives a graphic account of St. Hugh and his times.

L. J. C.

What are Saints? By C. C. Martindale, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 1s. These broadcast talks achieved some notoriety, since the B.B.C. received many letters of protest against such propaganda being allowed. Indeed, the lives of these "unusual ladies or gentlemen" (to quote from a peculiarly fatuous objector) are a very effective challenge to a comfortable Protestantism, which, surprisingly, appears to persist. St. Paul and the Curé d'Ars,

to mention two of them, reverse our usual values in a startling way. But the Christian who tries to venerate the image of his Master manifest in His saints can only be grateful to Fr. Martindale.

The Fourth Gospel and the Life of Today. By Mary R. E. Lyman. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. An admirable specimen of a type of book which has a great vogue in America and is hardly found in England, for want of a sufficient public. A public of well-educated, keenly alert readers is presupposed, who can appreciate good stuff but are content to be ignorant of the detailed study on which critical judgments are based. Miss Lyman takes a critical view (one can hardly say *the* critical view) and expounds it most attractively. "St. John" is an attempt to interpret the Gospel to a Hellenistic world which attached little importance to historic fact and was keenly interested in mysticism. The writer of the Gospel equates the Logos with the historic Jesus and shows that His words and acts were of immeasurable significance, just because they were those of the Logos. If he seems little interested in ethics, it is because he concentrates his attention on the motives out of which action springs. The twentieth century is a parallel to the early second century.

Self. By A. H. McNeile. Heffer. 2s. We cannot be too often reminded of the danger of letting Self creep into our religion, and no one is better qualified to write a little book on the subject than Dr. McNeile, with his incomparable simplicity and wide reputation as a spiritual guide. If the present book leaves a slight sense of disappointment, it is because *Self-Training in Prayer* and its companions have roused great expectations. It is difficult to deal satisfactorily with Self without more psychology than is here given; a smattering of psychology is now so common that the religious public may be assumed to be able to profit by a simple psychological treatment. A more serious criticism is that the Holy Spirit is ignored in these pages, which are based on the idea of the soul in its littleness standing over against God in His greatness. That God is also within, in some sense permeating the Self, complicates the problem. Studied by itself, Dr. McNeile's book might lead to scrupulosity.

Charles Gore: Father and Son. By John Gore. John Murray. 3s. 6d. *Charles Gore.* By Gordon Crosse. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. Perhaps the writers of these charming impressions of the great Bishop will pardon us if we content ourselves with warmly recommending these books and saving our comments on his life and influence until the promised full-length biography appears.

The Pastor and his Guide. By E. F. Odling. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Nineteen short papers on different aspects of the priest's life. The theme running through them is that he should seek for the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the affairs of parochial life instead of being a slave to routine.

Through the Prayer Book. By Dyson Hague, D.D. Longmans. 3s. 6d. A popular and devotional exposition by one who cherishes our incomparable liturgy. What can be finer than "Dearly beloved brethren . . ." with its "democratic friendliness"? We read of the "fine spirit of Anglican independence," of "the fantastic doctrine of transubstantiation," of "the rationalism of the Church of Rome." The outlook of the book is not ours, but we cannot quarrel with a writer who loves the Prayer Book so dearly.

St. Paul's Life and Letters. By A. C. Baird, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 1s. An addition to the Primers for Teachers and Bible Classes, which are one of the things they do better in Scotland. In printing, value for money, and solid scholarship it is a model of its kind.

The Dynasty of Pius. By G. W. Rushton. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. Brief chapters on the Popes who have borne the name of Pius, ending with the present occupant of the Holy See.

W. K. L. C.